1980

A System For The Evaluation Of Urban And Suburban Elementary School Principals.

Mary Kathryn Nebgen
University of the Pacific

A SYSTEM FOR THE EVALUATION OF URBAN AND SUBURBAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

University of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

---

by

Mary Kathryn Nebgen

May 1980

This dissertation, written and submitted by

Mary Kathryn Nebgen

is approved for recommendation to the Committee on Graduate Studies, University of the Pacific

Dean of the School or Department Chairman:

Oscar T Jarvis

Dissertation Committee:

Roger L Reimer Chairman

Fred Juskal

Elmer A. G Dawson

Ruth Marie Faucett

Dated April 25, 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

Page

Chapter Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A sincere thanks is extended to the many fine individuals who helped me to complete this dissertation. The members of my dissertation committee--Dr. John Bahnson, Dr. Elmer Clawson, Dr. Ruth Faurot, Dr. Fred Muskal, and in particular the committee chairman, Dr. Roger Reimer--are deserving of tribute for the unselfish devotion of their time to analyze the dissertation problems and suggest unique and often brilliant solutions.

Secondly, I thank the typist of this dissertation, Ms. Pat Reimer, for the long hours of effort she has put into the manuscript.

Thirdly, I thank the individuals who responded to the survey. Without their responses, the dissertation could not have been completed.

Finally, I thank my husband Arthur, whose moral support, patience, encouragement, and willingness to eat canned beef stew enabled me to complete the project.

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

One who holds the position of elementary school principal has a potential for influencing both education and society, for it is during the elementary school years that students develop the foundation of knowledge and the attitude toward education which will remain with them throughout their lives. Although it is the teacher who is responsible for the development of knowledge and attitudes in the classroom, it is the principal who is responsible for this development in the entire school. Research shows that the behavior of the elementary school principal directly affects the type and quality of education received by young students.[1]

Despite the acknowledged importance of this pivotal position in the educational system, few systematic attempts have been made to develop a system for assessing the effectiveness of those who hold it.[2] The expectations for the position held by particular referent groups, the relative importance which each of these expectations should hold in determining the effectiveness of the position

---

[1] California State Department of Education, Office of Program Evaluation and Research, School Effectiveness Study (Sacramento: Department of Education, 1977), p. 22; Winfield Scott Christiansen, "The Influence of the Behavior of the Elementary School Principal on the School He (sic) Administers" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1962), p. 15.

[2] Terry Barraclough, Administrator Evaluation, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 074 588, April, 1973.

incumbent, the methods of evaluation of effectiveness, and the appropriate evaluator have been either ignored or inadequately examined by researchers.[3] In view of the importance and potential for leadership and positive change in the educational process which are inherent in the position of the elementary school principal, it is imperative that a comprehensive system be developed for assessing the effectiveness of those who have such potential for educational influence over the formative years of American youth.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to develop a comprehensive system for the evaluation of the elementary school principal which would encompass the following aspects of the position: (1) the competencies of the position, weighted in order of importance; (2) the method of evaluation for each competency; and (3) the evaluator for each competency. The system was designed so that it could be utilized in any urban or suburban elementary school, in any district. It is anticipated that use of the system will provide districts with information useful in guiding the professional growth process and in making decisions regarding transfer, demotion, and promotion. Specifically, the study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. In the evaluation of elementary school principals, what competencies are considered important by teachers,

---

[3]George B. Redfern, "Appraising Managerial Performance for Salary Purposes" (paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February, 1974).

principals, and superintendents?

2. How does each group compare regarding their perceptions of the relative importance of each competency?

3. How does each group compare regarding their perceptions of how these competencies should be evaluated?

4. How does each group compare regarding their perceptions of by whom these competencies should be evaluated?

5. Are there significant differences between urban and suburban samples regarding what competencies should be evaluated?

6. Are there significant differences between urban and suburban samples regarding the relative importance of each competency?

7. Are there significant differences between urban and suburban samples regarding how competencies should be evaluated?

8. Are there significant differences between urban and suburban samples regarding by whom competencies should be evaluated?

Procedure

The literature in the field of principal evaluation was reviewed, and a list of potential competencies of the elementary school principal was developed based on this review. A survey was then constructed, which was designed to yield information on the relative importance of each competency of the principalship, the preferred

method of evaluation, and the preferred evaluator, as perceived by each role group. Completed surveys were analyzed to make comparisons and to provide a basis of information on which to develop the evaluation system which was the purpose of the study.

Significance of the Study

Evaluation is one of the most widely discussed processes in today's educational circles. In the past decade, attempts to make educational systems accountable to their publics through evaluation processes have proliferated at a rapid pace. Legislative bodies at both national and state levels have authorized funds to be used expressly for evaluating educational programs to determine their effectiveness.[4] Reports of evaluations of established educational programs, of innovative approaches, and of teacher performance are plentiful in the literature. Yet despite these trends toward accountability, few attempts have been made to design a systematic evaluation process for elementary school principals.[5]

Evaluation is nothing more or less than an imperative for the elementary school principalship. Without well-planned evaluation of the performance of the elementary school principal, judgments of the effectiveness of the position incumbent become vague, uncertain, and subject to speculation and subjectivity. Intelligent evaluation can provide a rational basis for policies, decisions, and actions which

---

[4]Debra D. Nygaard, Evaluating Administrative Performance (Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service, 1974), p. 5.

[5]Keith Goldhammer, The School Principal, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 145 540, October, 1977.

will lead to improvement. The results of this study provide a comprehensive, valid, and reliable appraisal process for determining the effectiveness of the elementary school principal in an urban or suburban school district. The data clarify and provide a rational perspective for reconciling role expectations for the principalship of different referent groups. Use of the system by school districts will enable each principal to recognize her or his own specific areas of strength and of needed improvement, will result in improved programs of inservice, and will identify those whose performance is unacceptable and those whose strengths and potential indicate future advancement to other specialized roles in the system.

Limitations of the Study

The study has the following limitations:

1. The investigator was concerned with the design of an evaluation system for elementary urban and suburban principals. The study, therefore, did not include information regarding rural and/or secondary school principals.

2. The study was limited to a stratified random sample of the urban and suburban school districts in the state of California.

3. The study was limited to perceptions of the evaluation process of teachers, superintendents, and principals. It did not, therefore, include information regarding the perceptions of students or parents.

Rationale for the Exclusion of Students from the Study

The purpose of the study was to design a system for the evaluation of the elementary school principal which would encompass the important aspects of the position and of the process. Students at the elementary school level are, as a general rule, unable to perceive and conceptualize, and are unfamiliar with, the many aspects of a principal's role. Most students at the elementary school level have limited contact with the principal and are thus apt to perceive her or his job from their own narrow experience. Thus the inclusion of students as a part of the development of the design was considered inappropriate.

Rationale for the Exclusion of Parents from the Study

Research indicates that those who are most closely in contact with a position have the clearest conceptualization of the realities that face the incumbent who holds that position.[6] Parents, as a general rule, observe principals in different situations and under different conditions from teachers and superintendents. Because of these differences in observations, parents are most likely to perceive the effectiveness of the principal in terms of her or his personal relationship with them or with their children, and omit in their evaluation more global and certainly equally as important factors of leadership in curriculum and instructional improvement.[7] As the

---

[6]David L. Elliott and Thomas J. Sergiovanni, Educational and Organizational Leadership in Elementary Schools (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), p. 123.

[7]William W. Savage, "Teachers and Parents Describe the Effective Principal's Behavior," Administrator's Notebook, IV (September, 1955), pp. 1-4.

research shows, parents--even those most active in school-community groups--see only part of the job; most often their concern with the position is indirect, originating from the effect of the position on their own children's teacher.[8]

It is recognized by the investigator that parental expectations for the principal's role cannot be ignored, for they play an important part in the success of any school administrator. One purpose of this study, however, was to design a workable system for the evaluation of the elementary school principal which could be implemented in a school district. Given the realistic constraints of administrator attitudes toward evaluation by parents, their inclusion would be impractical. The principal's responsibilities in assessing and responding to parental expectations have, however, been carefully delineated in the survey upon which the system is based. As Spindler points out, a school administrator cannot satisfactorily fulfill the diverse expectations of all of the parent groups within a heterogeneous school population;[9] a solution to this perennial problem will not be suggested by this study.

Definition of Terms

The terms used in this study are defined as follows:

---

[8]Elmo R. Giulieri, "The Role of the Elementary School Principal as Perceived by P.T.A. Executive Board Members and Principals" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1963), p. 141; Truman Owens, "A Study of the Role of Elementary Principal as Perceived by Parents" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1963), p. 113.

[9]George D. Spindler, Education and Culture (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963), p. 238.

Elementary School - A school which includes grades kindergarten through six, or grades one through six.

Elementary School Principal - The chief administrative officer of an elementary school. The term as used in the study applies only to full-time elementary school principals responsible for the administration of a single elementary school, and does not include teaching principals, principal/superintendents, or principals responsible for more than one school.

Competency - A task or responsibility of a position, the successful fulfillment of which may be identified not by a single discrete act but by a summation of behavioral incidents.

Competency Statement - A description of performance which delineates the demonstration of skills and knowledge for specified outcomes related to task implementation.

Teacher - An elementary school teacher responsible for the instruction of a group of students (average twenty-eight to thirty) at one school. Teachers of special education classes and resource teachers responsible only for small group instruction are eliminated from this category.

Suburban Elementary School - An elementary school which is located in that portion of a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area which remains after subtracting the central city.[10]

---

[10]Richard A. Rossmiller, James A. Hale, and Lloyd E. Frohreich, Fiscal Capacity and Educational Finance (Madison: University of

Superintendent - As used in this study, refers to the Central Office administrative officer who is responsible for the evaluation of the district's elementary school principals. This may be the superintendent in some districts; in others, it will be her/his designee.

System - An integrated assembly of interacting elements designed to carry out cooperatively a predetermined function.[11]

Urban Elementary School - An elementary school serving a neighborhood located within the central area of a city in a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area with a population of 150,000 or more. A Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, as defined by the Bureau of Census consists of a county which contains at least one city of 50,000 or more.[12]

Organization of the Study

The study is organized into five chapters. In Chapter I, the purpose of the study, the limitations of the study, the significance of the research, and the definitions of terms are presented. The literature pertaining to the elementary school principalship and the evaluation of the elementary school principal is reviewed in Chapter II. The methodology and procedures utilized to obtain the necessary data with which to develop the evaluation system are discussed in Chapter III.

Wisconsin, 1970), p. 9.

[11]Charles D. Flagle, William H. Huggins, and Robert H. Roy, Operations Research in Systems Engineering (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1960), p. 58.

[12]Rossmiller, p. 9.

In Chapter IV the data are analyzed and compared. In Chapter V, the systems for elementary principal evaluation are presented--one for urban elementary principals, and one for suburban elementary principals --as well as conclusions and recommendations for further study.

Summary

The systematic evaluation of the elementary school principal is vital to the improvement of the performance of those who occupy this position. Yet research indicates that present methods of evaluation are incomplete and inadequate. The purpose of this study was to design a system for the evaluation of the elementary school principal which would encompass what should be evaluated, how, and by whom, and would be based on the perceptions of the most significant reference groups for this position--teachers, superintendents, and principals. A survey was conducted to determine the expectations and preferences of each referent group for what competencies should be evaluated, how, and by whom, and to weight competencies according to perceived importance. The results of the study provide a comprehensive process for the evaluation of the elementary school principal.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature as developed in this chapter will deal with the following areas: (1) the evolution of the elementary school principalship; (2) the elementary school principal of the 1970's; (3) the history of principal evaluation; (4) recent trends in the evaluation of principal performance; and (5) problems in principal evaluation.

The Evolution of the Elementary School Principalship

To design a system for the evaluation of the elementary school principal, an understanding of the present status and responsibilities of this position is necessary. In order to develop a perspective on this present status of the principalship, a historical review of the origin and evolution of the position will be undertaken in the following sections: (1) the origins of the principalship; (2) the emergence of the profession: 1920-1945; and (3) the expanding duties of the position: 1946-1970. This historical approach to the problem will contribute to a deeper insight and a keener appreciation of present-day practices.

The Origin of the Principalship

The first schools in the United States were established by the colonists around 1635. In 1642, Massachusetts was the first state to pass a law requiring families to see that children learned to read and

understand the principles of religion and the laws of the country. In 1647, additional legislation was passed which required townships to establish and maintain schools.[1]

These early schools had only one teacher, who in addition to his/her teaching duties, assumed responsibilities which today would be considered administrative. Such duties, however, were secondary to the primary responsibility of teaching. Lay school committee members or other elected officials carried out other administrative functions.[2] Schools were loosely organized and little or no attempt was made to classify students. There were no graded courses of study, and the chief subjects were reading, writing, and arithmetic.[3] Naturally, this type of one-room school did not require a complex organization with highly specialized administrators.

Early in the nineteenth century, however, this situation changed. The growing popularity of the free public school, the rapid growth of urban centers, and the introduction of graded courses of study made evident the need for one authority to be responsible for coordinating the work of the various teachers and securing continuity of materials and progress through the grades. Pierce credits the Cincinnati public school system as being the first to establish the

---

[1]F. P. Graves, History of Education in Modern Times (New York: Macmillan Company, 1923), p. 104.

[2]Fred A. Snyder and R. Duane Peterson, Dynamics of Elementary School Administration (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970), p. 7.

[3]Roy A. Crouch, "The Status of the Elementary School Principal," Fifth Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals, ed. Arthur S. Gist (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1926), p. 207.

position of principal, in 1838.[4] In actuality, principals at this time were usually referred to as "Principal Teacher," indicating that teaching was the chief duty. The major responsibilities of these teaching principals, according to the Cincinnati Board of Education, were to: (1) enforce the rules and regulations of the Board; (2) classify students in grade levels according to achievement in mathematics; (3) ring the bells announcing school opening, closing, and recess; (4) account for all bills for salaries; and (5) insure that buildings and ground were clean and free of health hazards.[5] The principal teacher was thus an administrator of routine and a clerk. Supervision of teachers was done by laymen or by the superintendent, who visited schools, heard recitations, and advised teachers on instructional methods.[6]

By the mid-1800's, in many of the larger centers of population, the duties and responsibilities of the principal in attendance accounting, promotion, discipline, and methods of instruction had accumulated to such an extent that many principals were relieved of part or all of their work as classroom teachers. By 1867, in New York City, the principal of any school had no classroom, and no particular class or grade which he/she instructed, and for whose progress and efficiency he/she was responsible.[7] However, it was some years before

---

[4]Paul Revere Pierce, The Origin and Development of the Public School Principalship (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935), p. 9.

[5]Twenty-fourth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1853, p. 63.

[6]Snyder and Peterson, pp. 11-12.

[7]Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the

that condition became general throughout the country.

With the lessening of teaching duties of the principal and the impossibility of superintendents visiting schools in large districts, principals began to assume, in addition to clerical tasks, supervisory responsibilities. In 1888, George Howland of the Chicago public schools recommended that a considerable portion of the principal's time be devoted to visits to classrooms and conducting model lessons.[8] During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, however, the emphasis of the principal's position continued mainly on clerical duties. McMurry's study in 1911 of eighty-one New York elementary school principals showed that routine tasks such as signing salary warrants, ordering supplies, following up on truancy cases, taking care of building repairs, and seeing to discipline problems occupied two-thirds of the principal's time. The large size of city schools during this period--some having between four thousand to five thousand children--intensified the problem. What little time principals did spend on supervising teachers was fragmented and disorganized. While most principals readily admitted that their main efforts should be directed toward improvement of instruction, they simply did not have time to do it.[9] Reavis'[10] study, conducted in 1918, also showed that

---

City of New York, 1867, p. 7.

[8]George Howland, Thirty-fourth Annual School Report, City of Chicago, p. 72.

[9]Frank M. McMurry, Elementary School Standards (New York: World Book Company, 1914), pp. 185-207.

[10]W. C. Reavis, "The Duties of the Supervising Principal," Elementary School Journal, XIX (December, 1918), 279-84.

most of the elementary school principal's day was consumed with managerial duties; Spencer called attention to the frequency with which the elementary school principal "let routine matters absorb his attention to such an extent that he fails to give adequate attention to the significant problems of instruction."[11]

The Emergence of the Profession: 1920 - 1945

Interest in the principalship as a profession emerged during the 1920's, when a national organization of elementary school principals was founded.[12] The position of the principal became a topic of study in departments of education of universities, and programs of training for principals were established. Studies of the ideal role of the elementary school principal and the actual activities of those who held this position began to appear in professional journals.

These published studies of the actual responsibilities of principals emphasized the wide differences between theory and practice. McClure,[13] for example, conducted a study in 1919 in which he asked university professors and superintendents to rank the responsibilities of the principal in order of importance, and asked a group of forty-three Seattle principals to indicate the amount of time spent on duties

---

[11] Roger A. Spencer, "The Work of the School Principal in Supervision," Elementary School Journal, XX (November, 1919), 176-87.

[12] J. C. Morrison, "The Principalship Develops Supervisory Status," Tenth Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1931), pp. 157-58.

[13] Worth McClure, "The Functions of the Elementary School Principal," Elementary School Journal, XXI (March, 1921), 500-14.

in each category. Supervision was clearly considered of greatest importance to the university professors, but as revealed by the principals, the percentage of time spent on routine administrative tasks was far higher than that spent on supervisory activities. Boggs' study in 1919 also pointed out the continuing and excessive administrative duties of the principal. He summarized the seventy-seven Board regulations regarding the duties of the elementary school principal in thirty United States cities. The great majority of duties prescribed by school boards were purely clerical and routine tasks which could be easily delegated to an intelligent office clerk. Boggs concluded that:

> In the judgment of most school boards, principals are not mainly officers of professional supervision, but rather odd-job and clerical workers whose business it is to keep the machine smoothly running while other people perform the higher professional functions.[14]

Not all authors of the time were pessimistic about the principal's capacity to supervise in the face of other time-consuming tasks. William Gray, for example, suggested that principals reorganize their program more economically and supervise "in bulk" by giving broad criticisms to all teachers. He exhorted principals to require teachers to read books for their professional growth, and then discuss them at faculty meetings.[15]

Much of the lack of principal time for more "professional" duties stemmed from the lack of clerical help, and great progress in this regard was made in the early 1920's. Many cities provided

---

[14] J. Boggs, "Board Regulations Concerning the Elementary School Principal," Elementary School Journal, XX (June, 1920), 731-42.

[15] William S. Gray, "The Work of Elementary School Principals," Elementary School Journal, IXX (September, 1918), 24-35.

substitute teachers to do clerical work; the number of teacher clerks assigned depended on the size of the school. In New York, for example, one clerk was assigned to schools having between twelve and forty-seven classes, two to schools having between forty-eight and sixty-seven classes, and three to schools having sixty-eight or more classes. By 1927, cities of one hundred thousand or more had one clerk for approximately each fifteen classes.[16] Not all of this clerical help, however, was either trained or full-time assistance.

During the 1930's and early 1940's, the number of administrative duties and the lack of clerical help continued to hamper efforts of principals to elevate their position to one of professional status. Articles on the principalship appearing in the Ninth Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association stressed efficiency in budgeting time, influenced, no doubt, by the scientific management movement popularized by Frederick W. Taylor. Abbott[17] exhorted principals to "plan their work and work their plans;" he suggested that most routine tasks be delegated to teachers and that clerical work be done on Saturday morning rather than during the week. Bennett[18] suggested that principals devise standard record forms to simplify routine bookkeeping.

---

[16]Pierce, p. 212.

[17]Robert B. Abbott, "Plan Your Work and Work Your Plan," Ninth Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1930), pp. 193-206.

[18]Earle D. Bennett, "Standardized Record Forms Conserve the Principal's Time," Ninth Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1930), pp. 207-12.

The Expanding Duties of the Principal: 1946 - 1970

By the mid 1940's, the duties of the principalship had expanded. A study by the National Education Association completed in 1948, of one thousand eight hundred principals, showed that school size had decreased, and although many principals still had teaching duties, most schools had fewer than thirty teachers.[19] In cities with populations of over five hundred thousand, 71 percent of the elementary principals had full-time clerical help. In cities with populations of between fifty thousand and five hundred thousand, about 50 percent of the principals had full-time clerical assistance. Attendance officers were found for 78 percent of the principals.

With the lessening of clerical duties, principals began to spend more time in other areas. The 1948 study showed that 15 percent of the principal's time was spent on clerical duties, 29 percent on administration, 14 percent on pupil personnel, and 24 percent on supervision. Thus the time spent on supervision, long considered the most important responsibility of the principal, had increased. Tasks defined as "supervisory," however, included many activities which would not generally be included in this category today, such as "writing opinions for the superintendent" and "helping the central office to conduct studies."[20] Even though principals defined supervisory types of activities, for the most part, as working with staff to meet the needs of

---

[19] The Elementary School Principalship--Today and Tomorrow, Twenty-seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1948), pp. 54-68.

[20] The Elementary School Principalship--Today and Tomorrow, pp. 85-110.

children, this included not only helping each teacher with his or her problems, but also leading discussions at staff meetings and administering tests to classes of students.

Paralleling the increased emphasis upon the supervisory responsibilities of the elementary school principal was the emphasis on the community relations aspect of the position. The principal's participation in lay organizations, such as church and service groups, was recognized as an important factor in home-school communication and understanding. The stress at this time was on one-way communication--from the school to the community. In the 1948 study, however, fully 50 percent of the respondents showed little evidence of community interest and participation, for which they were gently reproached by their organization, which recommended that:

> About half of the principals should reconsider their present community relationships and increase both the quantity and quality of their participation in community affairs.[21]

Since the clerical chores of the position had diminished, principals now had more time to achieve the authority to carry out functions previously delegated to the superintendent or the central office staff. Most school districts of this period, however, were organized according to a bureaucratic model, following the organizational theories of Max Weber.[22] Precise divisions of labor and strict line-staff relationships were maintained. Principals were only one group of individuals in a chain of command extending from the student

---

[21] The Elementary School Principalship--Today and Tomorrow, p. 131.

[22] Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization (New York: Free Press, 1964).

through the principal and the central office staff to the superintendent and the board of education.

This largely inflexible organizational structure allowed few inroads to be made in expanding the principal's responsibilities. As revealed in the 1948 study of the principalship, the principals had little voice in selection and assignment of teachers, except in communities with populations below five thousand. Schedules and time allotments for various subject matter were generally made by the principals in cooperation with the teachers, but content of subject areas was done by district-wide committees or by the central office staff. Determination of specific methods of instruction was accomplished, most often, by the superintendent, the principal, and classroom teachers. Most principals were subordinate to assistant superintendents with respect to instructional decisions within their own buildings. The majority of principals had no responsibility for preparation of budgets.[23]

The post-war baby boom reached school age during the 1950's and dramatically increased the student population. This growth in numbers of students resulted in an increase in the principal's administrative responsibilities and subsequent decrease in the number of teaching and clerical tasks assigned. In 1958, the National Education Association repeated its study of the principalship to discover the changes in the role which had occurred over the decade since the former study. The Association found that the average number of teachers in the elementary school was eighteen, and the median enrollment was

---

[23] The Elementary School Principalship--Today and Tomorrow, pp. 69-83.

five hundred thirty-six. Full-time secretaries were employed for 47 percent of the principals, but 23 percent still had no clerical assistance whatsoever. The practice of using special central office resource personnel was growing; most districts had at least a general supervisor for curriculum and instruction.[24]

Most of the principals were responsible, with some assistance from central office personnel, for teacher supervision.[25] The emphasis at this time was on democratic leadership and human relations; administrators were to be concerned with "the building and maintenance of dynamic, yet harmonious human relations."[26] Effective supervision did include helping individual teachers identify, study, and take action on problems in their own classes, but also consisted of providing instructional materials and maintaining high morale. Elsbree reminded principals in 1951 that:

> Teachers are not dependent on the principal for advice as to how to perform their tasks. The principal's basic supervisory task is to set up environmental factors that are conducive to the continuous growth of the staff, to provide for exchange of views and information among them, and to encourage them to help one another by capitalizing on their own resources.[27]

The principal of the 1950's had gained responsibility in areas

---

[24] The Elementary School Principal--A Research Study, Thirty-seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1958), pp. 63-76.

[25] The Elementary School Principal--A Research Study, p. 32.

[26] Henry C. Metcalf and L. Urwick (eds.), Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett (New York: Harper, 1940), p. 14.

[27] Willard S. Elsbree and Harold J. McNally, Elementary School Administration and Supervision (New York: American Book Company, 1951), p. 17.

not covered a decade earlier. He/she selected instructional materials and developed the curriculum in cooperation with the faculty. Methods of instruction and pupil placement were determined at the school level. Although the principal still did not prepare the budget, he/she did report the general needs of the school to the central office staff. Most principals were responsible for teacher evaluation, but their evaluation did not affect teachers' salaries. A large proportion of principals had no voice in staff selection for their schools.[28]

The community relations aspect of the principal's position continued to receive emphasis in the 1950's. Many principals reported participation in community organizations, mostly churches. Of the principals surveyed, 85 percent had a parent-teacher organization and used it to build public understanding of school programs. For the first time, the National Education Association urged principals to consider parent participation in school programs to help in recognizing the problems and achievements of the school.[29]

Despite the increase in tasks assigned to the principal which may be considered "professional," many of his/her responsibilities were still routine clerical tasks. Principals devoted most of their time to these tasks, and only about one-third to supervision and instructional improvement. In the National Education Association study, only about 11 percent of the principals felt directly responsible for the instructional program, and only 59 percent felt recognized

---

[28] The Elementary School Principal--A Research Study, pp. 105-18.

[29] The Elementary School Principal--A Research Study, pp. 77-89.

as a leader.[30]

During the early 1960's the activities of the elementary school principal were expanded to include many different areas. The Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration identified these areas as follows: (1) instruction and curriculum development; (2) pupil personnel; (3) staff personnel; (4) community-school leadership; (5) school plant and school transportation; (6) organization and structure; and (7) school finance and business management. Within each of the seven task areas were listed from four to ten critical tasks. For example, in the area of "pupil personnel" the critical tasks were:

1. Initiating and maintaining a system of child accounting and attendance.
2. Instituting measures for the orientation of pupils.
3. Providing counseling services.
4. Providing health services.
5. Providing for individual inventory service.
6. Arranging systematic procedures for pupil assessment.
7. Establishing means of dealing with pupil irregularities.[31]

A total of fifty-two tasks of the principal were identified.

The National Education Association also conducted a study of the elementary school principalship, in 1968. Few changes were found from the Association study completed in the previous decade. Their survey

---

[30] The Elementary School Principal--A Research Study, pp. 37-42.

[31] Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, Better Teaching in School Administration (Nashville: Peabody College for Teachers, 1963).

of 2,317 elementary school principals revealed that almost half of these principals were still not entirely free from teaching responsibilities. Full-time clerical help was available for 58 percent of the principals, and 21 percent had the equivalent of more than one clerk, but 9 percent had no clerical help at all. Administrative tasks--organizing the program, making management decisions, formulating general operating rules, coordinating the activities of pupils and teachers, and maintaining communication with the central office--required 26 percent of the principal's time; clerical tasks, 14 percent; and supervision, 26 percent. The principal's supervisory role within the school was still perceived as one of creating a climate for program improvement; 57 percent of the principals believed their most effective way to improve instruction was to "create a climate in which teachers, individually or collectively, are encouraged to experiment and to share ideas."[32] Curriculum development consumed 7 percent of the principal's time, as did improving public relations and working with parents. For the first time, self-improvement and professional growth activities were recognized as a legitimate responsibility of the principal; principals reported spending 6 percent of their time on such activities.[33]

The number of resource personnel available to assist the principal had increased over the decade. Speech specialists, psychologists, reading specialists, science specialists, guidance counselors, librarians, and general curriculum specialists were available in much greater

---

[32] The Elementary School Principal in 1968, Forty-seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1968), p. 144.

[33] The Elementary School Principal in 1968, p. 38.

numbers, at least on a part-time basis.[34]

The principals' status within the school system in terms of authority and responsibility with respect to central office staff seemed to have declined over the decade from 1958 to 1968. Fewer principals had total responsibility for teacher supervision and evaluation. The design of the instructional program and the selection of instructional materials were, for most principals, a task shared with teachers and central office staff. The planning of the budget and developing of general school system policies were frequently handled by central office staff with little or no input from principals.[35]

The community relations aspect of the principal's job underwent a change of emphasis over the decade from 1958 to 1968. Lay organizations, such as churches and business groups, were no longer perceived as effective vehicles for home-school communication and understanding. Instead, principals favored conferences for parents in the school, visits to the school by individual parents, and working closely with parent organizations.[36] Gross and Herriott's study of the principalship in 1964 confirmed this observation; fully 98 percent of the principals surveyed responded that conferring with parents was of great importance.[37]

Principals in both the National Education Association study

---

[34] The Elementary School Principal in 1968, pp. 69-77.

[35] The Elementary School Principal in 1968, pp. 53-61.

[36] The Elementary School Principal in 1968, p. 145.

[37] Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriott, Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965), pp. 100-101.

and in Gross and Herriott's research reflected dissatisfaction with the way they spent their time. Lack of administrative and clerical help was cited most often as the reason for this dissatisfaction, but also the load of central office demands was mentioned twice as often as in 1958 as adversely affecting their use of time.[38] The N.E.A. study also revealed a declining trend in the leadership role of principals; more principals thought that the central office expected them to merely support or follow administrative directives.[39]

The Elementary School Principal of the 1970's

The job of the elementary school principal in today's world is increasing in complexity. Social forces, organizational changes, and the economic situation have multiplied the demands made on the elementary school principal in the past decade. These demands have been particularly intensified in the urban schools. In this section, the situation of the elementary school principal in the 1970's will be discussed, and recent literature regarding the responsibilities of the elementary school principal will be reviewed.

Social Forces Affecting the Principalship

The 1970's have been an era of social change. Schools are social institutions and as such are affected by social changes;[40] they are not isolated from the influence of other forces of the

---

[38] The Elementary School Principal in 1968, p. 147.

[39] The Elementary School Principal in 1968, pp. 53-61

[40] Snyder and Peterson, p. 203.

society. Any strong force operating in the society will inevitably have an influence upon the educational process.[41] In this section, attention will be directed to the following social changes occurring during the 1970's which have had an effect on the role of the elementary school principal: community involvement, compensatory education, and court and legislative mandates.

Community Involvement. The time is clearly gone when the principal can confine his or her efforts largely to what takes place within the school building. Because of the nature of the public educational enterprise the school must derive its support from the outside world.[42] A sound school-community relations program is necessary to gain this needed support, and the role of the principal is a most important one, for the principal serves as the administrative head of the closest public agency to the neighborhood and to community residents.

The need has arisen, in the 1970's, for more extensive communication with the community. Stout and Langdon found that parents want to know the details about the school's program--curriculum, methods of teaching, school services, the teacher, and the school's operation.[43] Parent-teacher conferences, newsletters and bulletins, and home visits have increased in the 1970's.

---

[41]Ralph B. Kimbrough and Michael Y. Nunnery, Educational Administration (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1976), p. 309.

[42]Larry W. Hughes and Gerald C. Ubben, The Elementary School Principal's Handbook (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978), p. 282.

[43]Irving W. Stout and Grace Langdon, "What Parents Want to

The emphasis on one-way communication from the school to the home, however, has also shifted to an emphasis on two-way communication. School-related groups, such as the Parent-Teacher Association and the School Advisory Committee, have proliferated. Such groups are composed of staff, parents, and community members. While they may be nominally advisory in nature, their true political influence may have an effect on the elementary school principal's decisions in regard to school programs. Special interest groups of parents often cause cleavages and conflict in the entire school community which the principal must manage effectively. Regardless of the ideological differences in the community, it has become the responsibility of the principal to appreciate, understand, and work cooperatively with community members of all persuasions.[44]

There is a price to pay, however, for the new emphasis on community involvement in the schools. There is a limit to the principal's time and energy. When there are expectations that he/she will spend more time on community relations, important as they are, then his/her contribution to instructional leadership may be affected.[45]

Compensatory education. Recent statistics indicate that there are more than fourteen million young people under seventeen years of age in the United States who are affected by environmental factors

---

Know About Their Schools," Nation's Schools, 60 (August, 1971), 45-48.

[44]James M. Lipham and James A. Hoeh, Jr., The Principalship: Foundations and Functions (New York: Harper and Row, 1974), p. 337.

[45]William B. Levenson, "School Principals: On the Cross-Fire Line?" Clearing House, 45 (December, 1970), 216-18.

that limit their achievements.[46] Federal and state compensatory education programs for these students have proliferated over the past decade. As programs have grown, the number of rules and regulations, and the paperwork requirements for categorical programs, have also increased. Most compensatory education projects have at least the following requirements: (1) a separate budget with restrictions on spending in some areas; (2) a process for identification and provision of services to categorically funded students; (3) a parent advisory group which meets regularly to assist the principal in decision-making regarding the categorical program; (4) project personnel, including aides, resource teachers, community liaisons, psychologists, and clerks, all of whom are under the principal's supervision; (5) special materials, and in some cases methods of teaching, prescribed by the project; and (6) evaluation reports to the funding agency. Some compensatory education programs also require parent participation as volunteers in the program, and parent education activities offered by the school to parents of project participants.

The elementary school principal of today must take a leadership role in organizing and implementing compensatory education programs in compliance with the laws relating to each funding source. Given the multitude of requirements for categorical programs and the fact that conflicts and discrepancies between state and federal funding requirements are not uncommon, the task of the elementary school principal in implementing successful compensatory education programs for identified

---

[46]Keith Goldhammer, The School Principal, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 145 540.

students becomes a major organizational and leadership challenge.

The legislature and the courts. Seldom before in the history of education in the United States have the courts and the legislature taken action which has impacted to such a great extent on public education. Recent years have witnessed an upsurge in the magnitude of school-related statutory enactments, federal legislation, and court decisions.[47] As Peterson notes:

> Civil rights acts, both federal and state, extension of the concept of due process, vesting of property and other rights in the expectation of continued employment, and extension of rights through judicial interpretation of constitutional guarantees have expanded the boundaries of legal contention.[48]

Elementary school principals must now have a working knowledge of complicated legal principales dealing with staff and student rights, such as control of student conduct, admission and attendance of students, student records, school transportation, security of employment of professional and classified staff, and the rights of handicapped and bilingual students. The growing complexity of legislative enactments and court decisions in these areas has placed great demands on the principal's time, for he/she must not only be aware of legal requirements but must ensure that the school's programs are implemented in accordance with such requirements.[49]

---

[47]LeRoy J. Peterson, Richard A. Rossmiller, and Marlin M. Volz, The Law and Public School Operation (New York: Harper and Row, 1978), p. ix.

[48]Peterson, Rossmiller, and Volz, p. x.

[49]Dennis Mangers, The School Principal: Recommendations for Effective Leadership (Sacramento, California: Assembly Education Committee Task Force for Improvement of Preservice and Inservice

Organizational Changes

Along with changes in the social structure of the society during recent years have come changes in the organizational structure of school districts. These changes, the most notable of which are increased specialization and collective negotiations, have brought about changes in the role of the elementary school principal of the 1970's.

Increased specialization. The explosion of knowledge in many fields and a growing awareness of the many kinds of competence that are needed to make education effective have resulted in the increasing specialization of school personnel.[50] The elementary school principal of today often has as staff members reading specialists, bilingual education teachers, special education teachers, psychologists, counselors, preschool teachers, instructional aides, and community liaisons. The consequences of this proliferation of school-based specialists are: (1) it is increasingly difficult for the principal to know half as much as his staff members know about their fields of proficiency, so that he/she often feels ill-qualified in many respects to advise or evaluate them; and (2) the task of coordinating the work of many specialists has become increasingly critical.[51]

Training for Public School Administrators, 1978), pp. 7-8.

[50]Donald A. Erickson, "Forces For Change: A New Role for the Principal," Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal, ed. Richard W. Saxe (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1968), p. 286

[51]Erickson, p. 287.

Collective negotiations. One of the most crucial issues to affect the principal's role in recent years is the movement toward collective negotiations. Negotiated agreements now include all matters involved in the educational program--salaries, retirement plans, class size, teacher assignment, promotion and transfer, length of school day and year, and length and frequency of faculty meetings.[52] Collective negotiations have resulted in the loss of broad discretionary powers once held by the principal; the principal's influence and power has clearly been eroded.[53] Collective negotiations concerning working conditions in the schools have substituted centralized decision-making for decentralized decision-making on the management side. School principals have lost significant discretion in the conduct of their own school programs.[54]

Principals are as much concerned about teacher welfare and the importance of the learning process as teachers themselves; they have considered themselves part of the instructional team.[55] But collective negotiations have changed the structure of the decision-making process and forced the principal to abandon a neutral role as mediator between the staff and administration and assume an often active role as adversary to teachers. Principals become part of a

---

[52]Oscar T. Jarvis and Hasken R. Pounds, Organizing, Supervising, and Administering the Elementary School (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1969), pp. 17-21.

[53]Charles R. Perry and Wesley A. Wildman, The Impact of Negotiations in Public Education: The Evidence from the Schools (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970), p. 119.

[54]Perry and Wildman, p. 214.

[55]Jarvis and Pounds, p. 20.

"management team," which tends to accentuate conflict between teachers as a group and those who supervise them.[56] Those teachers who once looked to the principal as a source of instructional support now view him or her as a potential threat to their job security, professional status, and economic advancement.[57]

In addition, principals are often excluded from the bargaining process. In a study of administrators in a three-state area, Watson[58] found that in none of the school districts did principals participate in the bargaining process. Yet principals are faced with the responsibility for dealing with new arrangements and agreements. The principal must be able to interpret the agreement reached with the teachers and to apply it in an acceptable manner or grievances by teachers may result.[59] Grievance procedures can be used by teachers to reflect poorly on the principal's ability to administer a school. The principal of today must adjust his or her role to maintain effective avenues for the exercise of professional and administrative leadership despite the restrictions of the collective negotiations agreements.

The Economic Situation

For the first time in the history of public education in the

---

[56]R. E. Randles, "The Principal and Negotiated Contracts," National Elementary Principal, 55 (November/December, 1975), 57-58.

[57]Ronald F. Stone, "The Principal as Chief Negotiator: Some Concerns for Teacher Supervision," Educational Leadership, 35 (April, 1978), 577-79.

[58]Bernard C. Watson, "Teacher Militancy and Collective Negotiations," Perspective on the Changing Role of the Principal, ed. Richard W. Saxe (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1968), p.277.

[59]Hughes and Ubben, p. 165.

United States, the financial situation of the public schools of the 1970's has declined. Declining enrollments, pressures for other governmental services, and unfulfilled expectations have resulted in great resistance to additional educational spending.[60] This resistance has been accompanied by a demand for public accountability--an intense desire to know what the school tax dollar is actually buying. Community groups are seeking conclusive evidence of the quality education they have been told about. Teacher militance and rising salaries are generating a reaction which wants proof of a corresponding increase in productivity.[61] Leon Lessinger, former Associate Commissioner of Education, has stated: "With increased pressures for tax relief real evidence of results based on more than hope is essential."[62]

The elementary school principal of today must adapt to declining enrollment and falling expectations. Traditional solutions to educational problems--spending more money or adding a new program--no longer suffice.[63] As education finds itself farther back in the line of public priorities, it becomes the principal's responsibility to effectively manage the decline by reallocating existing resources.

Particular Problems of the Urban Elementary School Principal

Among society's most difficult problems in education are

---

[60]Walter I. Garms, James W. Guthrie, and Lawrence C. Pierce, School Finance (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978), p. 3.

[61]Levenson, pp. 216-18.

[62]Levenson, p. 217.

[63]Garms, Guthrie, and Pierce, p. 5.

those of the metropolitan area.[64] The difficulties mentioned above are all exaggerated in the urban school. Demands for community involvement in the urban elementary school are greater and are complicated by the fact that the community is generally not composed of a group of people with the same value system but of special interest groups with differing expectations for what the school should do. Compensatory education programs are concentrated in the urban areas, for most students in need of such programs are located in these areas.[65] Seldom in the past have educators faced the challenge of very large schools full of the very poor, many of whom come from broken homes or homes where conditions do not motivate one to learn. Sizer noted that these conditions "suggest that the urban schools face a task far harder than the suburban schools, a task requiring imagination and considerable resources."[66] Recent legislation and court decisions of course affect all elementary school principals, but particular legislation, such as that concerning bilingual education, has a greater impact in urban areas. Increased specialization is most evident in urban areas, and the impact of collective negotiations on the areas of decision-making of the elementary school principal is greatest here. Financial difficulties of schools in urban areas are severe, for their buildings are old, their maintenance costs high, a greater proportion

---

[64]Theodore L. Reller, Educational Administration in Metropolitan Areas (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1974), p. 8.

[65]Garms, Guthrie, and Pierce, p. 23.

[66]Theodore R. Sizer, "The Schools in the City," Urban Studies, ed. Lewis K. Loewenstein (New York: Free Press, 1971), pp. 210-28.

of teachers are at the top of the salary schedule, and they are often operating on a narrowing tax base.[67]

Additional problems face the urban school principal which are not as crucial for the principal in suburban or rural areas. One is the transiency of the student population. Urban schools often have annual transiency rates of as much as 120 percent of the student body. Coping with this turnover rate and the negative effects it can have on teaching and learning becomes a major challenge for the elementary school principal in the urban school district.[68]

A second area of particular concern for urban elementary school principals is the problem of size. As the cities have grown, city school systems have become large and complex bureaucracies. The wave of dissatisfaction with the schools during the 1960's fostered many studies which were critical of the bureaucratic nature of city school systems.[69] Decentralization of control to provide for more community input and other approaches to reorganization have been suggested. At any rate, the urban schools have created problems for administrators in being responsive to clients and to community demands.

Thirdly, elementary school principals in urban schools of today must cope with the problems of segregation and integration. Complex forces of urbanization have produced cities that are segregated by social status, race, ethnic group, and other social and cultural

---

[67]Raymond C. Hummel and John M. Nagle, Urban Education in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), pp. 168-202.

[68]Hughes and Ubben, p. 5.

[69]Kimbrough and Nunnery, p. 317.

qualities.[70] According to Sirjamaki:

> Such segregation is both voluntary and involuntary. Some groups choose to reside in certain neighborhoods because of social, economic, religious, prestige, or other reasons; others must live in neighborhoods because they are forced to by customs, laws, or their own poverty.[71]

The neighborhood school tradition tends to effectively segregate the school population according to the segregation in the city.

Opposition to desegregation often arises from all sectors of the school community: staff, parents, community groups, and the students themselves. This opposition to desegregation has further hindered the elementary school principal's ability to provide a good educational program. Urban elementary school principals facing desegregation find they need to provide staff development in attitudes, misconceptions, and human relations, and in meeting the needs of all students. They must actively promote positive community relations, anticipate parent concerns, and be prepared to reassure them with concrete information. They must also institute curriculum changes to meet the needs of particular students.[72]

The Responsibilities of the Elementary School Principal of the 1970's

Social forces, organizational changes, and the economic situation have altered and expanded the job of the elementary school principal. In developing an evaluation system for the position incumbent,

---

[70] Kimbrough and Nunnery, p. 313.

[71] John Sirjamaki, The Sociology of Cities (New York: Random House, 1964), p. 202.

[72] Jarvis and Pounds, p. 16.

it was necessary to define what he/she should be doing. Several researchers have considered this problem, with generally similar results. Most have concurred on the main areas of the principal's responsibilities--curriculum and instruction, staff personnel, student personnel, community relationships, and finance and business management. The number and specification of elementary school principal responsibilities in each area, however, is generally different. McIntyre,[73] for example, listed eight key areas of principal responsibility and thirty-two competencies which principals should fulfill. Demeke[74] cited seven general areas of responsibility for the elementary school principal, and one hundred and eight specific tasks to be accomplished. Stoops, Rafferty, and Johnson[75] established thirty-seven responsibilities of the elementary school principal, in the three general areas of leadership, staff, and community. Lipham and Hoeh[76] cited sixty-six competencies of the principal, in the six traditional areas of responsibility. Project R.O.M.E.[77] listed eighty competency

---

[73]Kenneth E. McIntyre, "Administering and Improving the Instructional Program," Performance Objectives for School Principals, eds. Jack A. Culbertson, Curtis Hanson, and Ruel Morrison (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974), pp. 152-69.

[74]Howard J. Demeke, Guidelines for Evaluation: The School Administrator (Phoenix: Arizona State University, 1976).

[75]Emery Stoops, Max Rafferty, and Russell E. Johnson, Handbook of Educational Administration (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1975), pp. 853-873.

[76]Lipham and Hoeh.

[77]Chad D. Ellett, Results Oriented Management in Education, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 131 591, December, 1976.

statements in seven different areas; Harris'[78] system included seven areas of responsibility and eighty-one major competencies. Thus the number of tasks for which an elementary school principal may be held accountable ranges from thirty-two to one hundred eight; there is no agreement in the research as to which of these tasks are most important to the effectiveness of the person holding the position.

The History of Principal Evaluation

The preceding section has provided a perspective on the origin and development of the position and responsibilities of the elementary school principal. The position evolved from that of head teacher and chief bell-ringer to manager of a myriad of multiplying responsibilities. As the position of the principalship evolved, the evaluation process of those who held this position was also evolving. In this section, the history of the evaluation of the elementary school principal is reviewed. There are several reasons for developing a perspective on the history of principal evaluation. First, it is useful to see a problem at a distance; perspective often minimizes the impulse to resort to piecemeal solutions. Second, an historical perspective often shows that a problem or method thought to be unique has a series of historical antecedents. Third, an historical perspective provides a check against making invalid comparisons between past and present.

In actuality, the evaluation of the performance of elementary

---

[78] Ben M. Harris and John D. King, Professional Supervisory Competencies (Austin: University of Texas, 1975).

school principals was slow to become an established practice in most school districts. This stemmed from the fact that historically, school systems had small and fairly simple organizational structures. The superintendent knew--or thought he/she knew--his/her principals intimately and did not need a formal process for evaluating their performance.[79] As school systems developed in size and complexity, however, early superintendents were forced to turn over local school supervision to the principals, and to devote their own efforts, in turn, to supervising the principals.[80] In the cities, it was not long before a multiplicity of duties made it impossible for the superintendent to adequately supervise the activities of elementary school principals; the logical step was to employ assistant superintendents to inspect schools, give advice and assistance to principals, and to see that the policies of the superintendent were being carried out in the schools. These assistant superintendents can be credited with the development of the first evaluation systems for elementary school principals. As early as 1870, assistant superintendents in New York rated principals on the general management of their schools.[81] The rating was based on the following factors: (1) order during general exercises; (2) classification and organization of the school; (3) general direction given to the teachers; (4) conformity with a uniform

---

[79] Increasing the Effectiveness of Educational Management, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document Ed 032 635, February, 1968.

[80] Pierce, p. 89.

[81] Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1870, pp. 146-47.

plan of operation; (5) constancy of supervision; and (6) influence exerted throughout the entire school. Ratings were made on the basis of performance as observed by the assistant superintendent and categorized as follows: excellent, good, fair, indifferent, bad. Interrogation of classroom teachers regarding principal performance was recommended where a deficiency or neglect was obvious.[82]

Between 1875 and 1925, little evidence may be found of formal evaluation of elementary school principals in most school districts. In 1925, McClure[83] completed a study of the then current practices in rating principals in cities of one hundred thousand and over. He found that principal rating was not a customary procedure in the larger cities. In thirty cities, principals were not rated at all; in eleven, there were formal rating plans; and in five, there were informal rating plans. In the sixteen cities which did rate principals, annual rating was the common practice. Rating was most often done by district superintendents and assistant superintendents. According to the formal rating plans, the most important features of the principalship were in order of priority: (1) supervising the curriculum, including leadership of teachers, staff supervision, and results of instruction; (2) professional relationships of the principal, including cooperation with school officers, professional improvement, and academic preparation; (3) supervising the building and grounds; (4) office

---

[82] Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1875, pp. 219-21.

[83] Worth McClure, "The Rating of Elementary School Principals in Service," Fourth Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1925), pp. 424-46.

procedure; (5) supervision of pupils; and (6) personal relationships of the principal, including personality, adaptability, character, vitality, and initiative. In only three of the eleven cities making formal evaluations were the principals advised of the results of the evaluation process.

The "formal" evaluation plan used for elementary school principals in the Chicago school district was perhaps typical of the times. Three general categories of principal duties were included in this plan: administration, supervision, and leadership. Principals gained points in each category. Based on the total number of points achieved, they were rated as superior, excellent, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, and inefficient. The plan was so nebulous that even the district superintendent criticized it as being too subjective and not enough based on the actual achievement of students as the results of teaching and the principal's management.[84]

Willard's[85] study, completed in 1926, supported McClure's earlier findings. Willard surveyed superintendents to discover their procedures in evaluating the services of principals. The usual administrative procedure consisted of judgments by the superintendent and his/her staff based on any or all of the following: (1) observational visits to the school; (2) unsolicited teacher comments; (3) cleanliness of building; (4) cooperation with central office; (5) order and

---

[84] Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of Chicago, 1926, pp. 36-38.

[85] Frank E. Willard, "Judging the Efficiency of the Principal," Fifth Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1926), pp. 412-20.

discipline; (6) encouragement of innovation; (7) knowledge of educational literature; and (8) teacher quality. Willard felt that little was being done to evaluate the principalship because there were fewer principals than teachers in the system, and they stood in a more intimate relationship to the superintendent. Their duties were more varied and harder to evaluate objectively. The position had been developing, and consequently the standards were always changing. There had been a general tendency to rely upon personal impressions that did not readily submit to detailed analysis and classification according to any predetermined form, and were not, as a rule, reduced to writing. He recommended that a system should be developed to help principals improve which would include professional leadership, ability in management, supervision of instruction, cooperation in administrative policies, relations to teachers, and community leadership. Willard advocated forming opinions of a principal's work "based on some kind of objective evidence, even though the evidence cannot be objectively measured."[86]

McClure's and Willard's findings prompted Courtis[87] to recommend the formulation of specific practical objectives for the elementary principal's behavior. He suggested utilizing descriptive scales to evaluate principals on the following qualities: (1) structure (intelligence, age, temperament, voice); (2) equipment (training, study, marriage, political affiliation, wealth); (3) administration (condition

---

[86]Willard, p. 413.

[87]S. A. Courtis, "Possibilities and Potentialities in Measuring the Work of a Principal," American School Board Journal, LXXIV (December, 1926), 37-38+.

of buildings, organization, cooperation); (4) supervision; (5) leadership; and (6) clerical ability.

Tiegs[88] joined Courtis in recommending rating scales, but pointed out that an accurate rating of certain characteristics may be dependent upon their possession by the judge and/or their acquaintance with the person to be judged. Rumor and hearsay should not be taken into account, but factors over which the principal has no control such as innate student ability and student home environment, should be considered. The emphasis should be on self-improvement.

In 1930, the Pittsburgh school system instituted a "Program for Improving Administrative and Supervisory Procedures." Principals rated themselves and were rated by the associate superintendent on the following factors: personal equipment--health, carriage, voice, punctuality, and enjoyment of leisure; academic, professional and technical equipment--professional interest and growth, leadership, and curriculum; condition of the school building; administration; and supervision. As Weber pointed out, the rating did not include personal appearance and quality of character, but these were stressed at administrator's meetings. Evaluations were completed each year and the associate superintendent's ratings were used to establish merit pay.[89]

In 1934, the Board of Education of New York City adopted a

---

[88]E. W. Tiegs, "The Rating of Principals," American School Board Journal, LXXII (March, 1926), 43-45+.

[89]S. E. Weber, "Rating Teachers and Principals to Improve Their Service," American School Board Journal, 80 (April, 1930), 47-49.

new procedure for the rating of school principals.[90] Principals were rated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory in four categories: leadership, administration, supervision, and achievement of results. Leadership factors included such areas as personality, ability to inspire others, and moral leadership; administration included discipline, building care, staff assignment, and office procedures; supervision included teacher supervision and classification of pupils; achievement of results included pupil test results and general building appearance. Principals were rated by district superintendents on the basis of their observations.

In 1935, Towner[91] noted that little progress had been made in the formation of blanks on which to rate principals. His study of the rating of principals in 191 cities revealed that only 22 used a formal rating system. Assistant superintendents or district superintendents most often rated principals; in no instance did teachers rate principals, or was self-evaluation used. Annual rating of principals was the most common practice. Superintendents and assistant superintendents formed their judgments based on school visitations and conferences with the principal. Principals were rated in the following categories: administration, supervision, personality, professional characteristics, leadership, community relationships, teacher relationships, and executive qualities.

By 1935, the need for formal evaluation of the elementary school

---

[90] "A Procedure for the Rating of Principals," Elementary School Journal, XXIV (June, 1934), 732-34.

[91] Earl M. Towner, "The Formal Rating of Elementary School Principals," Elementary School Journal, XXXV (June, 1935), 735-46.

principal had become clear, although such systems were not widespread. Evaluation was being recognized as a step to professional improvement, and self-evaluation by principals was emphasized. Messner,[92] for example, in 1936, recommended that school districts devise a rating scale for principals which would include such factors as the principal's personality and philosophy of education; relationship with teachers, pupils, and parents; scholarship and training; general school administration; time allotment for supervision; and kind of teacher meetings. Several qualifying statements should then be selected for each main heading. For example, under the heading of "relationship with parents," the qualifying statements would be: (1) they speak highly of him/her; (2) he/she is quite well thought of; (3) parents say little of him/her; and (4) lots of friction. Messner suggested that the rating scales be used by teachers, district superintendents, and by principals as a self-evaluation method.

McAboy,[93] writing in 1938, devised a rating sheet for the evaluation of the elementary school principal which included the following four areas: pupil relationships, teacher relationships, community relationships, and superintendent relationships. Under each area were four questions dealing with specific aspects of the principal's duties. For example, in the area of teacher relationships, the questions were:

1. Is the principal's professional preparation reflected in

---

[92]Clarence J. Messner, "Appraising the Work of the Principal," National Elementary Principal, XV (June, 1936), 218-20.

[93]Charles E. W. McAboy, "Judging the Elementary School Principal," American School Board Journal, 96 (February, 1938), 26.

the attitude of the teacher to attain degrees of maturation through the desire toward professional growth?

2. Does the principal utilize the principle of delegated authority in promoting the teaching in his/her school through self-approval and mutual respect?

3. Does the principal intelligently use his/her knowledge of human relationships by promoting the strengthening of bonds between teachers and the principal?

4. Are the physical materials, school supplies, and equipment that aid teaching efficiency, adequately and accurately handled?

McAboy suggested that the rating sheet be used by the superintendent, by a general supervisor, and by the principal himself/herself.

In 1946, Keesler[94] devised a principal's appraisal program for use in the Seattle public schools. The program was designed primarily for principal self-rating, and consisted of five basic factors: supervision of instruction, public relations, business management, professional characteristics, and personality. The major factors were defined by four to seven subfactors or qualities which exemplified the major factors. In the area of personality, for example, the subfactors were: neatness, broad cultural background, scholastic attitude, diplomacy, sympathetic attitude, confidence,

---

[94]Don C. Keesler, "The Development of a Principal Self-Appraisal Program," American School Board Journal, 113 (September, 1946), 48-49.

ability to make decisions. Ratings were on a five-point scale, from "conspicuously absent, or unusually low merit" to "present to a marked degree, or unusually high merit." Factors were not weighted. Principals were to arrange a conference with the superintendent, after conscientious self-rating, to discuss their finding.

Evaluation by those most closely involved with the principal's role--the teachers--was recognized as important early in the 1950's. In addition, experts in the field began to advocate the personalization of standardized ratings scales according to the school's particular characteristics and needs. Elsbree and McNally,[95] in 1951, wrote that it was important to have teachers critically evaluate the supervisory behavior of principals; although checklists and rating scales were available, they suggested that it would be more profitable for the school to develop their own criteria of desirable leadership.

In 1956, Graff and Street[96] introduced the competency notion for the evaluation of school principals. They attempted to develop a picture of the job so as to point out just what the educational administrator would be doing when he/she was acting in a competent manner. They selected seven critical task areas--critical tasks being defined as identifiable units of behavior, the nonperformance of which would be detrimental to the outcomes needed for successful administration--which were organization and structure, finance and business management, student personnel, curriculum and instruction, staff

---

[95]Elsbree and McNally, pp. 434-35.

[96]Orin B. Graff and Calvin M. Street, Improving Competence in Educational Administration (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956).

personnel, school plant, and transportation. In the area of curriculum and instruction, for example, the critical tasks were stated as follows: In formulating curriculum objectives, the administrator:

1. Stimulates, in himself, the staff, and the school patrons, the development of understanding of the culture in which the school is located as well as its broader national and world setting.

2. Promotes clearer understanding of child growth and development and of the nature of the learning process.

3. Collects and makes available to instructional staff and others needed materials and information.

4. Makes certain that time and organizational machinery and means are provided to do the job.

5. Summarizes and coordinates progress in the clarification of objectives and disseminates information to all concerned.

6. Encourages school workers to keep objectives continuously in mind and to evaluate the school program in relation to them.

Graff and Strect recommended use of their competencies for personal development and for upgrading personnel.

In 1957, McGregor[97] pointed out that the modern emphasis on

---

[97]Douglas McGregor, "An Uneasy Look at Performance Appraisal," Harvard Business Review, 35 (May-June, 1957), 89-94.

the manager as a leader who strives to help his/her subordinates achieve both their own and the company's objectives was inconsistent with the judicial role demanded by most appraisal plans. He suggested that the principal establish short-term performance goals for himself/herself--specific actions or job targets. At the conclusion of the specified time period, he/she would make his/her own appraisal of his/her accomplishments, substantiating it with factual data where possible. The principal would then have a conference with his/her superiors, which would be a discussion of goals achieved and a resetting of new goals. Thus the principal would become an active participant in the evaluation process. McGregor freely admitted that his program rested on the assumption that the individual knows more than anyone about his/her own capabilities, needs, strengths, and weaknesses.

Strickler,[98] in 1955, conducted an analysis of current practices in the evaluation of the principal in school districts with populations over one hundred thousand. Over 96 percent of these school districts regularly evaluated principals. Use of rating systems had declined in popularity as reflected in the finding that only 9 percent used a rating scale. Evaluations were generally conducted using a cooperative appraisal by the superintendent and the principal, and most often represented a purely subjective judgment on the part of the individuals making the evaluation. Evaluations were, for the most part, based on the principal's executive ability, professional leadership, community leadership, professional growth, and personal qualities. Strickler

---

[98]Robert W. Strickler, "The Evaluation of the Public School Principal," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 41 (February, 1957), 55-58.

suggested that more definite criteria for the evaluation of principals be developed and that evaluation be designed to assist principals to improve their performance.

In the early 1960's, the usual evaluation of the performance of the principal was an over-all subjective judgment by the superintendent or assistant superintendent. The progress of an elementary school principal--his/her promotion, dismissal, transfer and salary--depended on the subjective opinions of his superiors. Hemphill noted that textbooks rarely discussed the evaluation of the elementary school principal and few school systems used formal evaluation of principals.[99]

In 1967, the administrators of the Madison School District in Phoenix, Arizona, along with Howard Demeke, developed a program for the evaluation of principal competency, The Madison Administrator Growth Program Through Self-Evaluation.[100] This program involved the evaluation of the elementary school principal in seven areas of competence. The system did not emphasize the qualities of the administrator as a person, but rather emphasis was placed on what he/she did and how competently it was done. The seven areas of competence were: (1) leader and director of the educational program; (2) coordinator of guidance and special education services; (3) member of the school staff; (4) link between community and school; (5) administrator of personnel; (6) member of the profession of educational

---

[99]John K. Hemphill, Daniel E. Griffiths, and Norman Frederiksen, Administrative Performance and Personality (New York: Teachers College, 1962), p. 219.

[100]Demeke, pp. 15-51.

administration; and (7) director of support management. Each general competency area included a number of subcompetencies. Fox example, under Area I: Leader and Director of the Educational Program, were:

1.1 Facilitates staff involvement in program development.

1.2 Initiates activities to improve instruction.

1.3 Facilitates productive cooperation with consultants to improve instruction.

1.4 Provides continuing programs of staff orientation.

1.5 Applies knowledge of human growth and development in planning learning experiences for all students.[101]

Demeke recommended that the instrument be used for self-evaluation and for evaluation of the principal's performance by his/her superiors.

The National Education Association completed a study in 1968 of evaluation practices in all school systems of over twenty-five thousand students. In 59 percent of these school districts administrators were not evaluated at all or were evaluated only informally. Most commonly, administrator evaluation was done by the immediate superior; only one school system used a group of administrators to evaluate. Usually, evaluations were conducted on an annual basis. Fifty-four school systems evaluated by pre-determined criteria in the following areas: administration--organizing ability; supervision--of instruction and curriculum; relationships with staff, students, and

---

[101] Demeke, pp. 49-55.

public; personal qualities; and professional qualities. Eight school districts evaluated principals on individual performance goals.[102]

Recent Trends in the Evaluation of the Elementary School Principal

From the origin of the position of the elementary school principal through the 1960's, efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of those who held this position were sporadic, uncoordinated, and were usually based on subjective and often biased opinions of superintendents and assistant superintendents.[103] In the past decade, however, new approaches to the evaluation of the elementary school principal have been proposed, and in some cases, implemented. Formal evaluation of the elementary school principal, however, is still not widespread, even in the larger school districts. A study done by the Educational Research Service in 1971 revealed that only eighty-four of one hundred fifty-four districts surveyed, or 54 percent, had formal evaluation plans.[104]

Recent trends in the area of elementary school principal evaluation have taken at least three different avenues. Some school systems have defined their own criteria for effective performance in

---

[102] Suzanne K. Stemnock, Evaluating Administrative Performance, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 032 635, February, 1968.

[103] J. E. DeVaughn, Policies, Procedures, and Instruments in the Evaluation of Teacher and Administrator Performance, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 061 607, March, 1975.

[104] Evaluating Administrative and Supervisory Performance, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 058 155, November, 1971.

the role of elementary school principal, and have attempted to measure the degree to which each principal has met this criteria. Some districts have simply allowed the principal to set his/her own objectives for performance and then evaluated the principal on the basis of the degree of successful implementation of these objectives; other districts have attempted to combine elements of both evaluation systems in their evaluation design.[105] In this section, each of these directions for principal evaluation will be discussed.

Evaluation on the Basis of Prescribed Standards

Evaluation systems which measure principal performance on the basis of pre-determined criteria are founded on the premise that although each school is a unique social organization with its own peculiarities, needs, and characteristics, some areas of competence are common to all principals.[106] Furthermore, the assumption is made that the principal's performance can be measured against these standards of competence. Campbell[107] has recommended this type of evaluation system; he has suggested that the major functions of the position be identified and defined in behavioral terms, and that in evaluating

---

[105] James F. Small, "Initiating and Responding to Social Change," Performance Objectives for School Principals, eds. Jack A. Culbertson, Curtis Henson, and Ruel Morrison (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1974), p. 31.

[106] Gaston Pol, Evaluation of Principals: A Competency-Based Methodology, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 127 668, July, 1976.

[107] Roald F. Campbell, The Evaluation of Administrative Performance, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 050 452, July, 1974.

fulfillment of these functions, evidence of positive outcomes should be cited by the evaluatee. Rosenberg[108] has also recommended evaluation of the elementary school principal on established standards. He suggested that school districts set up standards for behavior of elementary school principals in each of the following nine areas: school organization, instructional program, relationships with students, relationships with staff members, relationships with community, relationships with superiors, plant and facilities, schedules and accounts, and school climate. Such standards would include, for example, statements such as: (1) stimulates a spirit of high morale among staff members; (2) has a representative staff council that plays an active role in the development of school programs; (3) shows office, custodial, maintenance, and special services people that they are integral parts of the school staff; (4) keeps the work loads of staff members fair and reasonable; (5) establishes standards of performance for all staff positions in consultation with those holding the positions. Principals would complete a self-evaluation and would also be evaluated in on-the-job situations by the superintendent. Evidence of achievement of standards would include, as appropriate, observations, interviews, conferences, surveys, reports, letters, and examination of records.

The 1971 Educational Research Service study of school systems of twenty-five thousand students or more revealed that sixty-five of eighty-four districts surveyed which had formal evaluation plans used

---

[108] Max Rosenberg, "How to Evaluate Your Principals Without Scaring or Turning Them Off," American School Board Journal, 60 (June, 1973), 35-36.

predetermined performance standards to evaluate principal performance. In most of these districts, evaluation was accomplished unilaterally by the superintendent or his/her assistant, with a post-evaluation conference between evaluator and evaluatee to discuss the rating received.[109]

Evaluation by the superintendent or his/her assistant was typical of most performance standard evaluation plans described in the literature. In Hawaii, for example, principals are evaluated by the area superintendent according to a checklist of skills completed with the descriptive words poor, fair, satisfactory, good, or excellent. The checklist consists of various factors under the headings of instructional program, pupil personnel program, staff relations, management functions, community relations, departmental relations, and efforts toward professional improvement.[110]

In the North East School District in San Antonio, Texas, extensive use is made of self-evaluation. The principal annually completes a self-evaluation form consisting of seventy-three items dealing with personal responsibilities, administrative and professional responsibilities, student relationships, and physical traits. The superintendent then rates the principal on the same form. Later, in a conference, the evaluator discusses his/her ratings with the principal. No notification of the evaluation results is sent to the personnel office; the procedure's sole purported purpose is the

---

[109] Evaluating Administrative and Supervisory Performance.

[110] Evaluating Administrative and Supervisory Performance.

professional improvement of the principal.[111]

Other evaluation systems using predetermined performance standards have utilized sources of opinion in addition to that of the superintendent and/or assistant superintendent to measure the effectiveness of the principal's performance. Small[112] recommended team assessment by central office staff in situations where an interview or observation is involved and subjective judgments are a factor. Pol[113] developed a competency-based system for the evaluation of the elementary school principal which consisted of sixty statements of competencies considered crucial to successful performance in the role of principal. The principal, teachers, and the superintendent rated principals on a five-point scale; this rating identified areas of conflict in expectations and areas for competence improvement. District-wide and individual inservice programs were developed based on the results of this procedure.

In the Hauppauge School District in Long Island, New York, teachers' evaluations of the performance of the elementary school principal were utilized in principal evaluation. A committee of teachers and principals devised an evaluation instrument which consisted of eighteen statements rated on a scale of zero to five, covering the areas of administration and supervision, professional characteristics, personal characteristics, relationships with staff, relationships with students, and relationships with community. The instrument was

---

[111] Evaluating Administrative and Supervisory Performance.

[112] Small, p. 34.

[113] Pol, p. 7.

implemented on a district-wide basis, with teachers rating principals. The results were then discussed privately with each principal by the assistant superintendent.[114]

Saif[115] developed an evaluation system for the elementary school principal in Connecticut which included gathering information from teachers, principals, and assistant superintendents. The system consisted of various competency statements in the categories of management, personnel (student and staff), curriculum, human relationships, leadership, supervision, and coordination. The assistant superintendent rated the principal as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or outstanding; in addition, the principal rated himself/herself. The staff anonymously completed a thirty-two item survey of principal effectiveness. Results were then discussed with the principal.

A comprehensive system for the evaluation of the elementary school principal was developed in Georgia, called the Georgia Principal Assessment System.[116] This system selectively utilized input from principals, teachers, superintendents, and external observers. Eighty competency statements for school principals were developed based on reviews of the literature and principal input. The competency statements were categorized into seven areas of administrator responsibility:

---

[114]Joseph Sanacore, "How Teachers Can Evaluate Their Principal," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 60 (October, 1976), 98-101.

[115]Phillip S. Saif, A Handbook for the Evaluation of Classroom Teachers and School Principals, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 133 371, September, 1976.

[116]Chad D. Ellett, Understanding and Using the Georgia Principal Assessment System, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 149 153, February, 1978.

curriculum and instruction, staff personnel, pupil personnel, support management, school-community interface, fiscal management, and system-wide policies and operations; and six areas of administrator operations: collecting information, planning, communications, decision-making, implementing, and evaluating. For each of the competency statements, performance indicators were developed.

Principals rated themselves on one hundred statements relating to their behaviors; two ratings were provided for each statement indicating the principal's perceptions of how often they performed the task and how effectively they performed it. Teachers assessed the principal on sixty-four statements of principal performance deemed appropriate for assessment by teachers. An external observer conducted a structured interview with the principal and assessed his/her performance on thirty-six statements. The superintendent rated the principal on forty-two performance dimensions. Items selected for the instruments were demonstrated to have known relationships to teacher morale, and school achievement and attendance. Results of assessments were used to plan administrator inservice.

In Pueblo, Colorado, principals were evaluated on a checklist-type rating scale with space to record in narrative fashion comments on each area listed, the evaluatee's strengths, areas needing improvement, and an overall evaluation. Weights were established both for the rating given and the area evaluated, resulting in a composite value factor, which was translated into a one-word descriptive rating. The evaluation was conducted by a team of evaluators, which included the evaluatee's immediate supervisor who usually acted as team chairman, other administrators and/or supervisors with whom the evaluatee dealt

in performing his/her job, and often individuals whom the evaluatee supervised. In the case of the evaluation of principals and assistant principals, this meant one or two teachers served on the evaluation team. Principals were evaluated on personal characteristics, such as appearance, health, and disposition; leadership characteristics; success in problem solving; professional knowledge and understanding; success in supervision; ability to build morale; relationships with colleagues; relationships with the community; relationships with students; and attention to detail and routine.[117]

In Tulsa, Oklahoma, elementary school principals are evaluated every three years. One week in advance of the evaluation, the principal is notified that a team of administrators will arrive for an on-site visitation. The Administrative Director is solely responsible for the evaluation, but he/she may select other personnel to assist him/her in an advisory or consultative capacity, and if the principal so requests, the team may include one or more principals. The principal is expected to make advance preparations for the visit by completing a "Principal's Performance Appraisal" form to rehearse him/her for the interviews and to help him/her select supportive exhibits related to the items on the form, which will be used by the Administrative Director in the evaluation. The principal is also required to send a letter to the P.T.A. officers, inviting them to meet the visiting team at a designated time and place on the visitation day. He/she must notify all members of the faculty grievance committee and all teacher association delegates in his/her building to select

---

[117] Evaluating Administrative Performance.

from among their number a committee of not more than five to meet with the team. He/she may also appoint two faculty members to this committee.[118]

Gaynor[119] devised a number of instruments for measurement of the elementary school principal's performance by principals, teachers, and superintendents, which, in the author's own words, were "somewhat impressionistic." One of these instruments was the "Task Analysis Profile," which listed a number of tasks to be prioritized by the teachers, superintendent, and the principal, along with a description of the principal's ideal role in these tasks (doer, director, delegator). An effective elementary school principal, it was posited, would have a high degree of correspondence between his/her own self-expectations and those of the other groups. A second instrument consisted of a structured interview outline to check on the accuracy of the principal's perceptions of the political environment of the school. Other instruments enabled an observer to analyze a principal's actions as he/she trailed the principal during the course of the day to discover patterns of response which may be inconsistent with the objectives of the principal. Gaynor recommended that his instruments be used not for rating but as diagnostic tools to assist the elementary school principal to recognize and capitalize on his/her strengths and expose his weaknesses as little as possible.[120]

---

[118] Evaluating Administrative Performance.

[119] Alan K. Gaynor, "Preparing the Organization for Effective Response," Performance Objectives for School Principals, p. 64.

[120] Gaynor, p. 65.

In 1975, a diagnostic assessment system for professional supervisory competencies was developed by Evans, Harris, and Palmer.[121] The system was designed for use with administrators in school district and college situations. It consists of twenty-four critical competency statements describing complex behavior patterns, such as supervising in a critical mode; and eighty-one major competencies which are subsets of the critical competencies and are specific descriptions of behavior which can be observed in actual practice. All competencies are divided into seven task areas: developing curriculum, developing learning resources, staffing for instruction, organizing for instruction, utilizing support services, providing inservice education, relating to the public. The administrator self-evaluates, and is evaluated by a person who is familiar with his/her level of competence and understands the knowledge prerequisites to successful performance of the competencies. This may be a superordinate, colleague, or outside consultant. An evaluation is also done by a skills assessor--someone who has had many opportunities to observe the assessee perform in a job situation. This may be a principal, teacher, or program director.

Evaluation on the Basis of Individual Objectives

There has been a growing trend toward a particular type of evaluation which has been called, variously, the job targets approach, performance goals procedures, and management by objectives.[122] In this

---

[121] Michael C. Evans, Ben M. Harris, and Richard L. Palmer, A Diagnostic Assessment System for Professional Supervisory Competencies (Austin: University of Texas, 1975).

[122] Lorraine Poliakoff, "Recent Trends in the Evaluation of

approach, the administrator himself/herself defines his/her job targets or objectives and meets with the assistant superintendent to discuss and confirm his/her choice. A program of action to improve job performance is decided upon, progress is reviewed, and other job targets are formulated. Some systems of this nature require principals to select performance objectives from a list of objectives, while others allow principals to formulate their own individual objectives for performance. Some systems allow principals to decide on their priority objectives without interference or suggestions, while others require that these objectives be a matter of mutual agreement between the superintendent and the principal.

An assumption implicit in the job targets approach is that the elementary school principal not only knows what he/she needs to accomplish but also is able to figure out how to accomplish it. The job targets literature does not emphasize the use of evaluation instruments but relies on measures of performance as stated in individual objectives.[123]

The 1971 Educational Research Service study of the evaluation systems for the principalship revealed that nineteen of the eighty-four districts which formally evaluated principals used the performance goals approach. In the majority of these districts, the principal and the assistant superintendent, in conference, established mutually agreed upon performance goals for the evaluatee, the evaluator rated

---

School Personnel," National Elementary Principal, LII (February, 1973), 39-40.

[123]Poliakoff, p. 40.

the principal on his/her accomplishment of performance goals, and a post-evaluation conference was held to discuss the evaluation.[124]

The performance goals approach to principal evaluation has been recommended by several authors in the field and supported by professional associations. In 1977, the American Association of School Administrators adoped a resolution strongly supporting this type of evaluation. They recommended "Developmental Performance Evaluation," consisting of (1) review of goals, standards, and procedures, (2) design and adoption of personal objectives by the principal, (3) operational action, feedback of data from superintendent to principal, and principal to superintendent, (4) independent review and results analysis by the superintendent and the principal, (5) a joint annual review and analysis conference, and (6) follow-up planning and action. The Association also recommended that evaluation be conducted by the superintendent, who should be coach, communicator, and counselor. One or more assistants may fill the role of surrogate evaluators; however, the superintendent should review the entire process.[125]

In 1974, Lewis[126] recommended management by objectives as a means for evaluating administrative performance. He pointed out that traditionally the evaluation of administrators has been subjective and inept, with emphasis on effort expended not results achieved. He recommended specific descriptions of key tasks, developed by the

---

[124] Evaluating Administrative Performance.

[125] Administrator and Supervisor Evaluation (Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1977), pp. 64-71.

[126] James Lewis, Jr., School Management by Objectives (West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Company, 1974).

administrator. These should be precise, unequivocal descriptions phrased in such a way that they define the essential action accurately. Each key task would have a key result or performance standard, a statement describing the condition that would exist when the projected result had been achieved. Methods of checking performance would include observation or inspection, logs, problem reports, and discussion.

McIntyre[127] recommended that principals should participate in formulating the evaluation plan, and state his/her own performance objectives. All judgments should be supported with objective evidence. Principals should concentrate on a few crucial competencies, instead of an unmanageable number of requirements. Self-ratings should not be used for decisions such as re-employment, reassignment, promotion, or dismissal. McIntyre delineated eight broad functional categories of responsibility; within each category are two or more competencies. Specific illustrative behavioral manifestations of each competency are suggested. For example, Key Responsibility I is: The principal develops school unit goals and objectives to guide instruction. Competency I for this responsibility is: The principal relates needs of students to school system goals and legal requirements. Indicators of fulfillment of this responsibility are: (1) the principal initiated a study of diagnostic tests in order to select appropriate tests to identify specific needs of individual students; (2) the principal stimulated the guidance and counseling staff to conduct a survey of needs as perceived by the students; (3) the principal recommended modifications in school district goals to accommodate a need of many students as

---

[127]McIntyre, p. 152.

revealed in a study of mental health problems; and (4) the principal took action to correct a deficiency in meeting curriculum requirements of the state department of education.

Brick and Sanchis[128] developed a model for appraisal of the principal's performance in eleven areas of responsibility: curriculum development, instructional strategies, pupil personnel, community relations, staff personnel, school maintenance, plant operations, transportation, organization and structure, school finance, and business management. For each area of responsibility, specific job requirements were listed. For example, under the role of community relations, the following elements were included: providing the community with current information about its schools, providing the school with information about the community, securing community support for the school and its program, developing a commonality of purpose, effort, and achievement between the school and the community, informing the community of new developments and trends, developing a cooperation between the school and the other social institutions of the community, and securing a frank evaluation of the program of the school in terms of educational needs as the community sees them. For each element, a specific behavioral objective was written. For example, for the element "provides the community with information about their schools," the objective was: At a minimum, this program will increase community knowledge of schools fifty percent from the point of entry, as measured by pre- and post-tests. Principals selected goals, objectives, and activities through

---

[128]Michael Brick and Robert Sanchis, "Evaluating the Principal," Thrust for Educational Leadership, 2 (October, 1972), 32-34.

which each objective would be achieved. Limited field testing of the model showed that principals could fulfill their objectives and improve their levels of performance.

In the Kalamazoo plan, developed by Coats [129] for Kalamazoo, Michigan, elementary school principals were rated on specific performance objectives developed by the principal and assistant superintendent from pre-determined lists of objectives. Ratings were done on a five-point scale by the assistant superintendent, the director of elementary education, teachers, other directors and supervisors, resource people, and the principal himself. Each rating group was weighted to give an overall performance score. It is interesting to note that the ratings of the assistant superintendent and the director of elementary education were weighted fifteen, other directors and supervisors six, teachers and resource personnel five, and principal self-evaluation four.

In the evaluation procedures utilized in Arlington County, Virginia, the burden of assessment of performance and development of plans for improvement are placed primarily on the evaluatee. The evaluatee's immediate superior is more of a counselor and a reactor than an evaluator. Each year principals must take a hard look at their schools and their job performance and realistically assess what they have accomplished, what needs to be accomplished, and what can be done, both by themselves and the central office staff, to bring about needed improvements. The evaluatee's immediate supervisor evaluates the evaluatee's assessment of himself/herself, both on the evaluation form

---

[129] William D. Coats, Accountability in Education--The Kalamazoo Plan, Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 106 946, February, 1975.

and in a post-evaluation conference. The evaluation form is automatically reviewed by the appropriate assistant or associate superintendent, but both the evaluator and the evaluatee can ask for review by another individual if agreement is not reached between them.[130]

In Mount Diablo Unified School District in California, principals devise job targets dealing with problem solving for the school. The performance of the principal in relation to the instructional program, students, community, and general school administration is evaluated by parents, teachers, and students.[131]

Wills[132] compared evaluation systems in five school districts in 1976. Each of the five used objectives determined by the administrator or by the administrator and the evaluator. The categories of objectives most frequently used were: curriculum and instruction, staff and personnel, school buildings and equipment, school and community relationships. Evaluation most often was accomplished by a conference between the principal and the evaluator, although one school district did administer teacher, peer, and student questionnaires.

DeVaughn[133] developed an evaluation system for the elementary

---

[130]"How School Systems Are Evaluating Their Principals," American School Board Journal, 163 (July, 1976), 24-25.

[131]Evaluating Administrative and Supervisory Performance.

[132]Lewis A. Wills, Evaluation of Administrators: Issues and Priorities, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 125 083, June, 1976.

[133]J. Everette DeVaughn, A Manual for Developing Reasonable, Objective, Non-discriminatory Standards for Evaluating Administrative Performance, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 060 500, June, 1975.

school principal which included a list of job tasks and behavioral evidence which would indicate successful completion of these tasks. The principal and superintendent agreed on the principal's priority job tasks for that year; at the end of the year, the principal was rated by the superintendent on a five-point scale on completion of these priority tasks.

Evaluation Systems Using Both Prescribed Standards and Individual Objectives

Some school systems utilize evaluation plans which include elements of both prescribed standards systems and individual performance objectives. Coats[134] has recommended this type of evaluation plan; he suggested that each section of the rating be weighted as 50 percent of the total score. In the Pennridge school district in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, principals are evaluated by the superintendent twice a year on both common and individual objectives. A principal's individual objectives are assigned a point value by the other principals in the district through secret balloting. Successful completion of these individual objectives may earn the principal a maximum of two hundred fifty points. Successful achievement of the common objectives earns a maximum of seven hundred fifty points. Points are then used to determine merit pay.[135]

The Hyde Park, New York, school system instituted a performance

---

[134]William D. Coats, How to Evaluate Your Administrative Staff, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 093 043, April, 1974.

[135]Coats, How to Evaluate Your Administrative Staff.

appraisal system in 1974 which consisted of a set of written expectations for all principals, and job targets decided upon by each individual principal. Principals conducted an annual self-assessment in both areas and were also evaluated by the superintendent.[136]

Seal[137] developed a model program for the evaluation of the elementary school principal in Orange, California, in 1977. Each principal was evaluated as "met expectations" or "needs to improve" in the following areas: management decision-making, organizational skills, communication, budget, staff development, curriculum, and physical resources. Each area was defined by substatements; decision-making, for example, was defined thus:

> The competent administrator solves problems by using systematic procedures for decision-making, employs alternate methods of decision-making by involving individuals or representative groups, bases decisions on building or district policies and regulations.[138]

In addition to this evaluation, the Area Supervisor and principal met and established a minimum of three and a maximum of five performance objectives, on which the principal was evaluated annually.

The Ohio Association of Elementary School Principals developed guidelines for the evaluation of the elementary school principal in 1971. Their approach combined elements of job targets and job performance. They felt that there were certain universally accepted

---

[136]William E. Kerm, How to Evaluate Administrative Staff, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 105 649, April, 1975.

[137]Edgar Z. Seal, Developing, Implementing, and Evaluation of a Model Program for Evaluation of School Principals, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document Ed 156 679, March, 1977.

[138]Seal, A Model Program for Evaluation, p. 69.

responsibilities of the principal, on which he/she should be evaluated annually by the superintendent. These universally accepted responsibilities were: effecting a balance between administrative duties and the supervision of instruction, supporting others in their responsibilities, carrying out the policies and regulations adopted by the board of education, working in a team approach with each staff member to improve instruction, utilizing all available special services, securing staff participation in the solution of problems, appraising the quality of the instructional effort and the contribution of individual personnel, conducting the school's self-evaluation studies, maintaining an efficient procedure for securing and distributing books and supplies, planning cooperatively for staff development, solving behavioral problems, assuring the proper care of the building, making accurate records and reports, and working closely with the community and initiating public relations. In addition to evaluation on the elements listed above, the elementary school principal devised his/her own "job targets"--short and long range specific goals. Progress toward and fulfillment of job targets was assessed in a principal/superintendent conference.[139]

In the East Allen County Schools, in New Haven, Indiana, a management by objectives system of principal evaluation was implemented in 1974. Principals were evaluated annually on the basis of job expectancies and cooperatively developed individual objectives. Job expectancies consisted of competency statements in the areas of

---

[139] Evaluation of Administrators: Guidelines and Procedures, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 105 580, January, 1971.

supervision, planning, decision-making, interpersonal relationships, handling of physical and financial resources, and creativity. Principal performance was rated by the superintendent as distinguished, commendable, competent, adequate, marginal, or probationary.[140]

Problems in Principal Evaluation

As can be seen from the preceding discussion, the evaluation of the elementary school principal is a complex and difficult task. In this section, the following aspects of the problem will be considered: situational factors, differing role expectations, and evaluator bias.

Situational Factors

There is a general expectation that the elementary school principal can change things. Frequently, people who hold this expectation overlook the fact that performance is always a product of person and situation, not person alone.[141] Results--good or bad--may be due to influences other than that of the principal, such as the former principal, the assistant principal, staff members, the community, or changes in central administration policies.[142] As Losak points out, external factors beyond the principal's control such as legislative

---

[140] Administrator Management by Objectives, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 097 773, February, 1974.

[141] Campbell, pp. 1-2.

[142] Max Rosenberg, "The Evaluation of a School Principal" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1965), pp. 134-39.

enactments can contribute to the principal's perceived effectiveness.[143]

The expectation that the principal can control the school environment, the staff, and the students may result in the use of an evaluation system based on absolutes such as achievement tests, teacher requests for transfers, or almost any countable commodity. Whatever the base, principal evaluation programs of this type are predicated on a situation that is unknown to most principals.

Differing Role Expectations

The evaluation of the elementary school principal is further complicated by the fact that the different reference groups with which the principal has close contact may not agree as to the "good" or successful principal. The priority placed on different responsibilities by the different reference groups may be so widely divergent as to hinder an objective evaluation done from the viewpoint of more than one group.

A role may be defined as the expected pattern of behavior for the occupant of a position. If most groups held similar expectations for the principal's role, all would be well. However, such is not the case. Phillips' study of principals, teachers, and supervisors in the Oakland Unified School District showed that principals felt their most important responsibilities were: (1) giving specific help to individual teachers; (2) visiting classrooms to evaluate instruction;

---

[143] John Losak, "The Myth of Rational Evaluation" (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, April, 1975).

(3) administering the testing program; and (4) working with parents.

For the most part, teachers stressed the importance of those actions of the elementary school principal which allowed them to do the best job of teaching. To them, the most important actions of the principal were those which insured: (1) a minimum span of ability and achievement among their pupils; (2) relief from severe discipline cases; (3) that teaching materials are delivered promptly; (4) the school plant is well managed; (5) a smooth-running school organization; (6) a minimum of interruptions, and (7) assistance to be available on call. The actions most frequently mentioned by supervisors emphasized the importance of the principal developing his personal and professional leadership. The kind of a person he/she was, his/her knowledge of teaching, and his/her ability to analyze instructional problems were deciding factors in his/her effectiveness. They felt that the most important actions of the principal were: (1) providing a well-organized and smoothly administered school for the teachers and pupils; (2) helping the teachers secure needed materials; (3) visiting the classrooms; and (4) assisting the teacher in analyzing class progress through teacher-principal conference.[144]

Hemphill, Griffiths, and Fredericksen[145] conducted a study of the administrative performance of elementary school principals in the early 1960's. The expectations of 232 superintendents and 7,000 teachers were compared. It was found that superiors and subordinates

---

[144]John Phillips, "Principal Evaluation in Oakland," p. 3. (Mimeographed.)

[145]Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederiksen, pp. 348-49.

held differing expectations of principal behavior. Superintendents felt that good principals were those who demonstrate an ability to get along with superiors, know administrative practices, show interest in their work, stick to the job, understand written communication, and have knowledge of teaching methods and techniques. Teachers rated higher those principals who could get along with teachers, pupils, and parents, and show good informal oral communication skills. Hemphill concluded that the ratings of superiors stressed the nomothetic dimension of administration, while teacher ratings stressed the idiographic dimension. He noted that the judgments are not antithetical and that a superintendent, in evaluating the performance of a principal, would want both viewpoints.

Foskett[146] studied the way principals view their own position and the views of other populations within the school community. He administered a role norm inventory of forty-five statements dealing with how principals should respond to teachers, parents, students, and the administration, to twenty-two principals, elementary school teachers, members of the school board, and superintendents. The principals' perceptions of their appropriate role were most similar to those of the teachers; the views of the lay populations were the next closest to those of the principal's for the position as a whole. The third highest difference was between the views of the principals and those of the school board; the greatest difference was between superintendents and principals. Of particular interest was the fact that

---

[146] John M. Foskett, The Normative World of the Elementary School Principal (Eugene: Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1967).

the amount of agreement among the principals themselves regarding the norms for their position was only moderately higher than the amount of agreement among the lay population. Foskett concluded that the extent of agreement for the role of the elementary school principal was only moderate. He suggested that the consequences of this lack of agreement may be a broad tolerance of divergent views, as well as an absence of consistent group effort in a specified direction. He also suggested that the lack of a well-defined set of expectations may permit particular segments of the community to have a disproportionate amount of influence on principals, particularly when such segments are aggressive in making their views known.

Gentry and Kenney[147] studied the evaluation of the performance of principals in sixty elementary schools in Georgia. Teachers and principals evaluated the principal's performance using the Principal's Profile. The profile was divided into three operational areas: carrying out the role of democratic leadership, working effectively with school personnel, and working effectively with the community and its organizations. The three operational areas were subdivided into two hundred administrative actions and practices. Teachers and principals evaluated the performance of the principal on each of the actions and practices, using a five-point scale. Gentry and Kenney selected forty-six of the administrative practices for comparison purposes; on twenty-two of the forty-six practices, a significant difference was found between teacher evaluation of principal performance and principal

---

[147]Harold W. Gentry and James B. Kenney, "The Performance of Elementary School Principals as Evaluated by Principals and Teachers," Elementary School Administration, ed. Oscar T. Jarvis (Dubuque:

self-evaluation. In general, principals rated their performance higher than did teachers.

Falzetta[148] researched the role of the principal as perceived by teachers, principals, and superintendents. These three groups rated principals on twenty items having to do with the handling of six critical incidents. On thirteen of the twenty items, the ratings of teachers and superintendents were significantly different.

Frazier[149] noted that not only did reference groups differ on expectations for the principal's role, but reference groups often differed among themselves. He found that age, sex, and years of experience contributed to differences of opinion among teachers on expectations of the principal's behavior.

Evaluator Bias

Losak has stated that objective evaluation by an evaluator is an impossibility. He believed that human judgment will always have an element of bias and prejudice, and will be influenced by power relationships between the evaluator and evaluatee, and by rumor.[150] Since the evaluator is generally the superintendent or associate superintendent, who does not work with the principal on a day-to-day

---

William C. Brown Company, 1969), pp. 81-82.

[148]John N. Falzetta, "Role Expectations Held for the Elementary School Principal by Teachers, Principals, and Superintendents" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1967), pp. 148-50.

[149]Calvin M. Frazier, "Role Expectations of the Elementary School Principal as Perceived by Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1964), pp. 177-78.

[150]Losak, p. 8.

basis, distinguishing the productivity of the principal from other school-related factors is a difficult task.[151]

George Odione[152] pointed out the following problems of evaluator bias in principal evaluation systems: (1) past record--good past work carries over into the present; (2) compatability--a tendency to rate higher those we like; (3) recency of good work--yesterday is fresher in the memory than last week; (4) blind spots--the tendency not to see similar defects; (5) perfectionism, or expectations that are too high; (6) contrariness of the evaluatee; and (7) dramatic incidents, whether good or bad.

Summary

The position of elementary school principal originated in the urban schools of Cincinnati in 1838. Early principals were generally teachers as well; their main responsibilities were administrative and clerical. It was not until the 1920's and the founding of the Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association that the elementary school principalship began to be regarded as a professional position. From 1930 to 1960, the emphasis on teacher supervision and the improvement of instruction as important aspects of the principal's role increased dramatically, but so did the number of other tasks, such as school plant operation and school finance and

---

[151] Gary Natriello, et. al., A Summary of the Recent Literature on the Evaluation of Principals, Teachers, and Superintendents, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, E.R.I.C. Document ED 141 407, February, 1974.

[152] George Odione, "The Evaluation of School Principals," National Elementary Principal, LII (February, 1973), 36-38.

business management, which were required of the principal. Principals continued to find themselves devoting an inordinate amount of time to clerical tasks, and not enough time to the supervision of teachers.

The elementary school principal of the 1970's has inherited the numerous responsibilities of his/her recent predecessors, and more. Social forces, organizational changes, and the economic situation have expanded the job of the elementary school principal. The emphasis on community involvement has resulted in a need for school-community advisory groups and increased home-school communication. Compensatory education programs have increased both the paperwork burden and the number of employees the principal supervises. Legislative enactments and court decisions have placed great demands on the principal's time and energy in becoming aware of legal requirements and ensuring that they are implemented properly. The increased specialization of school personnel has resulted in increased needs for skillful supervision and staff coordination. Collective negotiations have decreased the discretionary powers of the principal and have often strained the relationships between the principal and the staff. The worsening economic situation of the school requires that the principal attempt to improve the educational program with declining resources.

These problems of the elementary school principal of the 1970's are especially prevalent in urban elementary schools. Added to these problems are the burdens of a high transiency rate, a complex bureaucracy, and desegregation.

Given the social and economic situation of today, what are considered to be the principal's responsibilities? Most authors in

the field have divided principal responsibilities into five areas: curriculum and instruction, staff personnel, student personnel, community relationships, and finance and business management. The number and specification of particular elementary school principal responsibilities in these areas has varied from thirty-two to one hundred nine specific tasks.

As the duties of the principalship evolved in number and changed in emphasis over the years, so too did the methods used to evaluate fulfillment of these responsibilities. In actuality, systems for the evaluation of the elementary school principal were slow to develop, and are still, in many districts, in the formative stages. Subjective judgments by the superintendent were the customary evaluation procedure in the majority of school districts until the 1970's. Those school districts which did utilize formal rating procedures evaluated such personal characteristics as voice, poise, and cheerfulness; rating procedures for the principal's supervision and administrative functions were generally imprecise and unreliable.

During the 1970's, two trends emerged in the evaluation of the elementary school principal. One was a movement toward the formulation of descriptive statements of competence against which the principal's performance could be measured objectively. The other was the job targets or performance goals approach, in which principals set their own objectives and were then evaluated on their achievement of those objectives. For both these evaluation systems, the customary evaluator was the superintendent or his/her designee, and the customary method of evaluation was observation and conferencing with the principal.

The slow development of systems of evaluation for the elementary

school principal may be attributed to the numerous problems involved in such evaluation. Situational factors, differing role expectations, and evaluator bias, have hindered the development of a reliable instrument for measuring the effectiveness of the elementary school principal's performance.

In addition, there is no general agreement in the literature as to what the criteria for effective administrative performance should be. Should the principal be evaluated on the overall performance of the school? Should specific dimensions of the principal's role become the focus for evaluation? Should principals set their own terms for the aspects of their performance to be evaluated? Should criteria for effectiveness in the role of principal differ from school to school?

Furthermore, little consensus has been achieved regarding how the evaluator shall determine that the criteria for effectiveness have been successfully met. Is observation a reliable method for evaluating effectiveness? Should written documentation be included? Will discussion sessions with the principal and/or the staff yield more reliable information?

Finally, the question of who is most qualified to evaluate the elementary school principal has not been resolved. The principal is an isolate; only the staff views him/her every day. The superintendent and associate superintendent rarely observe the principal at work. At best, they may see a representative sample of his or her performance. The assumption that the superintendent is qualified and has sufficient information on which to judge the principal's performance may often be unfounded.

None of the problems discussed above are insurmountable, and the

values to be derived from sound principal evaluation procedures are such as to merit continued striving towards their attainment. Faunce has written:

> It is human for people to wonder how they are doing. Most principals are handicapped in finding a dependable answer to this vital question . . . the principal who wishes to fulfill his role successfully is concerned with ways to evaluate his own work.[153]

---

[153]Roland C. Faunce, Secondary School Administration (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955), pp. 361-62.

Chapter III

THE PROCEDURE

The purpose of this study was to develop a system for the evaluation of urban and suburban elementary school principals. In this chapter, the procedures undertaken to accomplish this task are outlined and discussed under the following headings: (1) development of the survey, (2) sample selection, and (3) statistical treatment of the data.

Development of the Survey

Relevant books, periodicals, journals, and unpublished materials were reviewed in order to collect current information on the responsibilities of the elementary school principal and on the present state of the art regarding evaluation of this role. The literature review included sixteen books dealing with the principalship, twenty-five journal and periodical articles, eighteen ERIC documents, and nine unpublished sources of information. Based on this review, a survey was developed which included one hundred thirty-five competency statements. These competency statements were then categorized into eight different areas of interest. These categories were consistent with those established in the literature. Seven of the categories were related to the principal's competence in working with the instructional program, instructional supervision, the staff, students, the financial/physical resources, the community, and the school system. The principal's personal and professional characteristics made up the eighth

category.

After consultation with the dissertation committee chairman, it was decided that the length of the survey was such that few people would respond. One solution to the problem of excessive survey length would have been to generalize competency statements so as to include fewer, and more general, items on the survey. Such general items would not, however, reveal the specific information which was desired. Consequently, three separate surveys were constructed with the one hundred thirty-five competency statements divided among the three surveys. Each survey addressed some items in each of the eight categories and all surveys were comparable in length.

The surveys had a general heading for each category of principal competency, followed by a listing of specific competencies in question form. Respondents were asked to circle a number on a six-point Likert scale which indicated their opinion of the relative importance of each competency from "not important" to "extremely important." Respondents were also asked to identify who should be the preferred evaluator(s) for each competency. In this instance, respondents rated the superintendent, teachers, or principal as one, two or three. A rating of three indicated that the person(s) should have primary responsibility for evaluation; two indicated that the person(s) should be included in the evaluation; and one indicated that the person(s) should have no responsibility in evaluation.

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate, for each competency, their opinion of the efficacy of various methods of evaluation--superintendent/teacher conference, superintendent/principal conference, superintendent observation of the principal, or superintendent

observation of written documentation. Respondents rated each of these methods with a one, two, or three. Again, three indicated the best method(s) of evaluation, two indicated acceptable method(s), and one indicated poor method(s) of evaluation.

Standards of validity and reliability are essential characteristics of any research instrument. The survey was submitted for content validation to a panel of educators which included three principals, one superintendent, and three teachers. The survey was then revised based on their comments and suggestions. To establish survey reliability, the survey was submitted to three teachers, three principals, and one superintendent on two different occasions, three weeks apart. Comparison of the responses on the two separate survey administrations yielded a correlation coefficient of .89, indicating that survey responses were highly stable over time ($p<.05$). A further analysis of the reliability of each survey revealed that for Survey #1, the correlation coefficient was .96 ($p<.01$); Survey #2 had a correlation coefficient of .83 ($p<.07$); and the correlation coefficient of Survey #3 was .88 ($p<.05$). Thus Survey #1 had the greatest reliability, although all three surveys were highly reliable.

The Sample

The sample group utilized in this study consisted of seventy-five urban and seventy-five suburban superintendents, ninety urban and ninety suburban principals, and ninety urban and ninety suburban teachers. To select the urban sample superintendents, the California

Public Schools Directory[1] and the California Statistical Abstract[2] were consulted to determine which elementary or unified school districts in the state were located within Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas with a population of one hundred fifty thousand or more and at least one city of fifty thousand or more. A list of the school superintendents in elementary or unified school districts with at least one school with grade levels kindergarten through sixth or first through sixth and school district boundaries located wholly within the city limits of cities with populations of fifty thousand or more was then constructed. Using the Table of Random Digits,[3] seventy-five urban school district superintendents were randomly selected from this list. To determine urban principal respondents, systematic sampling with an interval of seventeen was used to select ninety urban elementary school principals from a population of one thousand six hundred, using the California Public Schools Directory as the information source. Urban teacher survey respondents were selected by the sample principals, who were instructed to give survey materials to the fourth classroom teacher on their alphabetical staff list.

To select the suburban sample superintendents, all elementary or unified school districts in the state which met the following conditions were listed: (1) located within a Standard Metropolitan

---

[1]California Public Schools Directory (Sacramento: Government Printing Office, 1979).

[2]California Statistical Abstract (Sacramento: Documents Section, State of California, 1979), pp. 11-14.

[3]Seymour Sudman, Applied Sampling (New York: Academic Press, 1976), pp. 223-26.

Statistical Area with a population of one hundred fifty thousand or more and at least one city of fifty thousand or more; (2) having at least one elementary school with grade levels kindergarten through sixth or first through sixth; and (3) located entirely outside of the city limits of a city of fifty thousand or more, but not more than ten miles outside of the city limits. The California Public Schools Directory and the California Statistical Abstract were consulted to determine which school districts to include in the list. Using the Table of Random Digits, seventy-five superintendents of these districts were then randomly selected for inclusion in the study.

To determine suburban elementary principal survey respondents, systematic sampling with an interval of seven was used to select ninety suburban elementary school principals from a total population of five hundred forty, using the California Public Schools Directory as information source. Suburban teacher survey respondents were selected by the sample principals, who were instructed to give survey materials to the fourth classroom teacher on their alphabetical staff list.

The above-described sampling procedures resulted in a sample which included five hundred ten units from seventy-five urban and seventy-five suburban districts in the state. After selection of the sample units, determination was made of which survey to send to each unit. All urban and suburban teachers, principals, and superintendents were listed separately and a systematic sampling procedure with a sampling interval of three was used to determine which survey would be sent to each sample unit. Each of the three surveys was submitted to a different sample group of thirty urban teachers and principals, twenty-five urban superintendents, thirty suburban teachers and

principals, and twenty-five suburban superintendents, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

SURVEY GROUPS

	Survey #1	Survey #2	Survey #3
Urban	30 Teachers 30 Principals 25 Superintendents	30 Teachers 30 Principals 25 Superintendents	30 Teachers 30 Principals 25 Superintendents
Suburban	30 Teachers 30 Principals 25 Superintendents	30 Teachers 30 Principals 25 Superintendents	30 Teachers 30 Principals 25 Superintendents

This sampling procedure, called multiple-matrix sampling without replacement, was developed chiefly by Frederic Lord[4] in the mid-fifties. Multiple-matrix sampling has the advantage of being time-saving for the individual survey respondent and having the ability to sample a domain widely, while still allowing the measurement of a large number of items with a small standard error of estimate.

---

[4] W. James Popham, Educational Evaluation (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), pp. 25-31.

Statistical Treatment of the Data

To discover how each group compared regarding their perception of the relative importance of each competency, the mean value of relative importance for each competency was calculated for each of the three respondent groups--superintendents, principals, and teachers. The significance of differences among groups was calculated by a two-way analysis of variance. The mean value of relative importance of each competency was then calculated for all urban and suburban respondent groups. The significance of difference between means of urban and suburban groups was calculated using a two-way analysis of variance. The mean relative importance for each competency was also calculated for each group by area and position, i.e., for all urban superintendents, teachers, and principals, and for all suburban superintendents, teachers, and principals. The significance of difference of interactions between area and position was calculated using a two-way analysis of variance. The data were then summarized by category of principal competency, and the relative importance of each category was compared using a two-way analysis of variance to determine significance of differences between and among respondent groups by area and position, as well as interactions between area and position.

To determine how each group compared regarding their perceptions of who should be involved in the evaluation of each competency, the mean value for each evaluator was calculated for each of the eight categories of principal competency, for each of the three respondent groups, by area and position. Using a two-way analysis of variance, the significance of difference between and among means and the significance of

interactions were determined.

To determine how each group compared regarding their perceptions of how the evaluation of the competency should be accomplished, the mean value for each method of evaluation was calculated for each of the eight categories of principal competency for each of the three respondent groups, by area and position. Using a two-way analysis of variance, the significance of difference between and among means and the significance of interactions were determined.

Summary

A literature review was undertaken to determine the current expert opinion regarding the role and responsibilities of the elementary school principal. As a result of this literature review, a survey was developed which listed one hundred thirty-five specific principal competencies in eight general areas. This survey was submitted to five hundred ten practicing educators--superintendents, teachers, and principals. For each competency, survey respondents rated the relative importance of the competency, indicated their opinion of who should evaluate the competency, and indicated their opinion of how the evaluation should be accomplished. The results of the surveys were analyzed to determine significance of differences between and among respondent groups, by area and position, and significance of interactions. In the next chapter, this data will be analyzed.

Chapter IV

DATA ANALYSIS

The data reported in this chapter are organized into three sections: analyses of the sample, analyses of the survey results, and summary of the chapter. In the first section, the number of survey respondents according to area and position is analyzed. In the second section analyses of the survey data are presented, in eight subsections: the principal and his/her relationship to the instructional program, instructional supervision, the students, financial/physical resources, the community, the school system, and the principal's personal and professional characteristics. In each subsection, the significant differences which are identified for each competency in terms of relative importance, preferred evaluator, or preferred method of evaluation are presented. In the third section, the findings of the survey data are summarized.

Analyses of the Sample

The total number of individuals receiving the survey was 510. Of these, 75 were urban superintendents, 75 were suburban superintendents, 90 were urban principals, 90 were suburban principals, 90 were urban teachers, and 90 were suburban teachers. An introductory letter describing the survey and its purpose and requesting respondent participation in the study was sent with each survey. A postcard reminder to return the survey was sent to non-respondents three weeks after the

initial survey mailing. A description of the survey respondents by area, position, and survey number is shown in Table 2.

Superintendents had the highest percentage of survey responses. The percentages of responses from urban principals was slightly higher than that from suburban principals and both urban and suburban teachers. A total of 58 percent of the surveys were returned.

Table 2

Survey Respondents

Position	Area	Number of Respondents Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 3	Percent Returned
Superintendent	Urban	16	15	16	63%
	Suburban	16	17	14	63%
Principal	Urban	18	17	18	58%
	Suburban	17	16	17	55%
Teacher	Urban	16	18	16	55%
	Suburban	17	16	17	55%

Analyses of Survey Results

This study was designed to develop a comprehensive system for the evaluation of the elementary school principal. Responses to four specific questions were sought from practioners in the field. The survey results are presented in this chapter and are focused on the following questions:

1. In the evaluation of the elementary school principal, what competencies are considered most important by urban and suburban groups of superintendents, principals, and teachers?

This question was answered by rank-ordering the specific competencies within each general category of competencies and by comparing these responses by position group (superintendent, principal, and teacher) and by area group (urban and suburban). The rank order positions of specific competencies within each category are discussed in this chapter.

2. Are there significant differences between the relative importance of competencies as rated by urban and suburban groups of superintendents, principals, and teachers?

This question was answered by comparing the relative importance of specific competencies as rated by position and area groups using a two-way analysis of variance. The results of this ANOVA are presented in this section. Only differences between and among groups which were significant at the .05 level are discussed.

3. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of position and area groups regarding who should evaluate the performance of the principal in each of the categories of competencies?

This question was answered by comparing the responses of the position and area groups regarding the preferred evaluator using a two-way analysis of variance. The results of this ANOVA are presented in this section. As with the second question, only differences between and among groups which were significant at the .05 level are discussed.

4. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of position and area groups of how the performance of the principal in each of the categories of competencies should be evaluated?

This question was answered by comparing the responses of the position and area groups regarding the preferred method of evaluation

using a two-way analysis of variance. The results of this ANOVA are presented in this section, and only differences between and among groups which were significant at the .05 level are discussed.

The analyses of the survey results are divided into eight subsections which represent the general categories of principal competencies identified in the survey. In each subsection, the findings of the survey are reported and discussed.

The Principal and the Instructional Program

A total of eleven specific competencies of the principal were included in the area of Instructional Program. The respondents indicated the relative importance of the competency, identified the preferred evaluator, and selected the preferred method of evaluation.

Competency rank. A rank ordering of the specific competencies in this category was performed to determine which competencies were considered most important by area and position groups. Area groups ranked the same competency, "the provision of a balanced instructional program," fifth in importance. They also ranked the last three competencies in the same order--"providing for the needs of limited English speakers," "providing for the understanding of other cultures," and "developing a school handbook." There was no competency in this category ranked the same by all three position groups. A review of Table 3 shows the inconsistency of rankings among all other competencies.

Relative importance. A two-way analysis of variance was performed to determine if significant differences existed between and among

Table 3

The Principal and the Instructional Program
Rank Order of Competency Importance*

Competency	Rank Order					
	All Groups	Urb.	Sub.	Supt.	Prin.	Tchrs.
1. Creates innovative climate	1	2	2	2	1	6
2. Ensures program meeting diverse student needs	2	1	3	1	2	5
3. Provides time for all teachers to meet together	3	3	1	5	4	1
4. Establishes procedures for evaluation	4	4	6	4	6	2
5. Collects and disseminates evaluation results	5	7	4	7	3	3
6. Provides for balanced instructional program	6	5	5	3	7	7
7. Establishes procedures for curriculum modification	7	8	7	6	8	4
8. Provides time for grade level teachers to meet	8	6	8	9	5	9
9. Provides for needs of limited English speakers	9	9	9	8	9	10
10. Provides for understanding other cultures	10	10	10	10	10	11
11. Provides for development of school handbook	11	11	11	11	11	8

* Presented in order of highest to lowest importance.

position and area groups in their perceptions of the relative importance of each competency in this category. Area group perceptions differed significantly for two of these competencies; suburban groups rated the "provision of a balanced instructional program" higher than urban groups, while urban groups rated "meeting the needs of limited English speaking students" higher than suburban groups. Significant differences among position group perceptions were found for six of the competencies. Principals rated "the creation of an innovative climate" and "the provision of a program meeting diverse students needs" higher than did teachers. Teachers rated the "dissemination of evaluation results" and the "development of a school handbook" higher than principals. Superintendents gave a lower rating than principals to the "provision of time for grade level meetings." Superintendents also rated the "provision of time for teachers from all grade levels to meet as a group" lower than did teachers. These data are presented in Table 4.

A summary of the relative importance of all of the competencies within the general category of Instructional Program was performed using a two-way analysis of variance. A significant difference was found between the responses of urban and suburban groups, with urban groups tending to rate all competencies in this category less important than did suburban groups. These results are presented in Table 5.

Table 4

The Principal and the Instructional Program
ANOVA Results: Relative Importance

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
1. Creates a climate in which innovative ideas are encouraged.	Area	1	0.012	0.024	0.878
	Position	2	4.435	8.932	0.001*
	Interaction	2	0.070	0.142	0.868
2. Provides for a balanced instructional program which includes the basic skill areas, music, art, science, social studies, and physical education.	Area	1	4.793	6.029	0.016*
	Position	2	1.802	2.266	0.110
	Interaction	2	5.482	6.895	0.002*
3. Provides time for teachers at each grade level to meet to discuss common problems.	Area	1	0.090	0.126	0.724
	Position	2	5.725	7.999	0.001*
	Interaction	2	5.901	8.245	0.001*
4. Provides for a school curriculum which leads toward an understanding and appreciation of other cultures	Area	1	2.532	2.902	0.092
	Position	2	0.523	0.600	0.551
	Interaction	2	3.335	3.823	0.026*
5. Establishes procedures for modification of curriculum content and organization where needed.	Area	1	1.058	1.140	0.289
	Position	2	0.859	0.926	0.400
	Interaction	2	1.620	1.745	0.181

Table 4 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
6. Provides for meeting the particular needs of limited and non-English speaking students.	Area	1	5.335	8.482	0.005*
	Position	2	0.479	0.762	0.470
	Interaction	2	1.501	2.387	0.098
7. Provides time for teachers from all grades to meet to articulate a coherent instructional program throughout the school.	Area	1	0.699	1.524	0.220
	Position	2	3.000	6.545	0.002*
	Interaction	2	0.093	0.203	0.816
8. Ensures the development of an instructional program which meets the diverse needs of students.	Area	1	0.029	0.062	0.805
	Position	2	1.931	4.042	0.021*
	Interaction	2	0.196	0.409	0.665
9. Establishes procedures for the evaluation of the instructional program.	Area	1	0.103	0.214	0.645
	Position	2	0.449	0.931	0.398
	Interaction	2	0.674	1.397	0.253
10. Collects and disseminates results of evaluation procedures to the staff.	Area	1	1.162	1.551	0.216
	Position	2	2.599	3.468	0.035*
	Interaction	2	0.450	0.601	0.550

Table 4 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
11. Provides for the cooperative development (with students, teachers, and parents) of a school handbook containing information about the school.	Area	1	0.109	0.085	0.772
	Position	2	4.924	3.828	0.025*
	Interaction	2	0.118	0.092	0.912

* Significant at the .05 level.

Table 5

The Principal and the Instructional Program
ANOVA Results: Summary of Relative Importance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
Area	1	1.443	4.944	0.027*
Position	2	0.679	2.325	0.100
Interaction	2	0.256	0.877	0.417

*Significant at the .05 level.

Preferred evaluator. A two-way analysis of variance was performed for the first general category of competencies to determine who the preferred evaluator of the performance of the elementary school principal in the area of Instructional Program was. Significant differences were noted between area groups. Suburban groups felt that the superintendent should be included in evaluation more often than did urban groups, and urban groups felt that teachers should be included more often than did suburban groups.

Position group perceptions of the preferred evaluator differed significantly among all groups. Superintendents felt they should be included more often than did both principals and teachers. Principals felt they should be included more often than teachers did, while teachers felt their own participation was appropriate more often than did the principals. These data are presented in Table 6.

Preferred method of evaluation. A two-way analysis of variance was performed to determine the preferred method of evaluation of the performance of the elementary school principal in the area of Instructional Program. Area group perceptions of the preferred method of evaluation differed significantly in two instances. Urban groups

indicated that the methods "superintendent observation of principal" and "superintendent observation of records" were acceptable more often than did suburban groups. Position group perceptions of the preferred method of evaluation also differed significantly. Teachers indicated that "a conference between the superintendent and teachers" was an acceptable method more often than did superintendents. Superintendents indicated that the methods "superintendent/principal conference," "superintendent observation of principal," and "superintendent observation of records" were acceptable more often than teachers did. These data are presented in Table 7.

Table 6

The Principal and the Instructional Program
ANOVA Results: Preferred Evaluator

Evaluator	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Sign. of F
Superintendent	Area	1	1.783	4.907	0.028*
	Position	2	7.246	19.937	0.001*
	Interaction	2	1.179	3.245	0.040*
Principal	Area	1	0.030	0.076	0.783
	Position	2	2.633	6.747	0.001*
	Interaction	2	0.610	1.563	0.211
Teacher	Area	1	2.519	8.302	0.004*
	Position	2	11.163	36.786	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.366	1.205	0.301

* Significant at the .05 level.

Table 7

The Principal and the Instructional Program
ANOVA Results: Preferred Method of Evaluation

Method of Evaluation	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Sign. of F
Superintendent/ Teacher Conference	Area	1	0.208	0.443	0.506
	Position	2	9.337	19.937	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.144	0.308	0.735
Superintendent/ Principal Conference	Area	1	0.087	0.247	0.619
	Position	2	9.652	27.346	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.082	0.233	0.792
Superintendent Observation of Principal	Area	1	1.797	4.742	0.030*
	Position	2	3.205	8.457	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.371	0.978	0.377
Superintendent Observation of Records	Area	1	2.039	6.121	0.014*
	Position	2	2.808	8.429	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.191	3.576	0.029*

*Significant at the .05 level.

The Principal and
Instructional Supervision

A total of twenty-two specific competencies for the principal were included in the area of Instructional Supervision. The respondents indicated the relative importance of the competency, identified the preferred evaluator, and selected the preferred method of evaluation.

Competency rank. A rank ordering of the specific competencies in this category was performed to determine which competencies were considered most important by area and position groups. The "maintenance

of a professional library for teacher use" was ranked lowest in importance by both urban and suburban groups. No competency was ranked exactly the same in importance by all three position groups. A review of Table 8 shows the inconsistency of rankings among all other competencies.

Relative importance. A two-way analysis of variance was performed to determine significant differences between and among position and area groups in their perceptions of the relative importance of each competency. Area group perceptions differed significantly for seven of the twenty-two competencies. Suburban groups rated the following competencies higher in importance than urban groups: "training staff to conduct inservice," "reviewing lesson plans," "observing classes," "providing feedback," and "assisting teachers to evaluate and adjust their instruction." Urban groups rated the "provision of follow-up services to teachers needing to improve their instruction" higher than suburban groups.

Position group opinions of the relative importance of the competencies differed significantly for thirteen of the survey items. Principals rated the "provision of follow-up services to teachers," "assistance in improving classroom atmosphere," "training staff to conduct inservice," and "arranging for and evaluating inservice programs" higher in importance than teachers. Superintendents rated "maintaining staff evaluation records," "recommending staff for dismissal or retention," "regularly observing classrooms and lesson plans," and "assisting teachers to establish goals and to plan" higher in importance than teachers. Teachers and superintendents rated

Table 8

The Principal and Instructional Supervision
Rank Order of Competency Importance*

Competency	Rank Order					
	All Groups	Urb.	Sub.	Supt.	Prin.	Tchrs.
1. Provides feedback to teachers	1	3	1	4	2	3
2. Provides follow-up services to teachers	2	1	7	5	1	5
3. Recommends teacher retention/dismissal	3	2	5	1	4	9
4. Assists teachers to adjust program	4	9	2	6	10	2
5. Assists teachers to evaluate program	5	10	3	7	6	6
6. Regularly visits classrooms	6	11	4	8	5	8
7. Develops uniform system of teacher evaluation	7	4	6	9	12	1
8. Assists teachers to establish goals	8	5	8	3	8	10
9. Assists teachers in teaching basic skills	9	6	10	11	7	7
10. Arranges for inservice	10	8	12	12	3	12
11. Assists teachers to plan	11	7	13	10	11	13
12. Maintains staff evaluation records	12	12	9	2	14	11
13. Provides for variety in inservice	13	14	11	17	15	4
14. Assists teachers to improve atmosphere	14	13	16	15	9	15
15. Guides teacher participation in inservice	15	15	17	13	16	18
16. Evaluates inservice programs	16	16	15	14	17	17
17. Participates in inservice	17	18	14	20	18	14
18. Arranges for teacher-requested inservice	18	17	19	16	19	19
19. Trains staff to conduct inservice	19	19	18	18	13	20
20. Reviews lesson plans	20	21	20	19	21	22
21. Schedules classroom visit in advance	21	20	21	21	20	16
22. Maintains professional library	22	22	22	22	22	21

* Presented in order of highest to lowest importance.

the "provision of a uniform evaluation system" higher than principals. These data are presented in Table 9.

A summary of the relative importance of all of the competencies within the general category of Instructional Supervision was performed using a two-way analysis of variance. A significant difference was found between the summary of responses of urban and suburban groups; suburban groups rated these competencies higher than did urban groups. A significant difference was also found between the responses of teachers and superintendents; teachers rated the competencies less important than did superintendents. These results are presented in Table 10.

Preferred evaluator. A two-way analysis of variance was performed for the second general category of competencies to determine who the preferred evaluator of the performance of the elementary school principal in the area of Instructional Supervision was. Area group perceptions differed significantly for preferred evaluator "teacher;" urban groups favored "teacher inclusion in evaluation" more often than did suburban groups. Position group perceptions differed significantly for all three categories of evaluators. Superintendents and principals indicated that they should be included in the evaluation more often than teachers. Teachers, on the other hand, felt that teacher participation in the evaluation of principal competencies was appropriate more often than did both superintendents and principals. These data are presented in Table 11.

Table 9

The Principal and Instructional Supervision
ANOVA Results: Relative Importance

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
12. Develops a uniform system of evaluation of teacher performance.	Area	1	0.217	0.704	0.404
	Position	2	2.372	7.694	0.001*
	Interaction	2	0.629	2.042	0.136
13. Schedules classroom observational visits in advance with the teacher.	Area	1	1.096	0.581	0.448
	Position	2	4.348	2.304	0.106
	Interaction	2	9.197	4.872	0.010*
14. Provides for consistent follow-up services to teachers needing to improve their teaching performance.	Area	1	5.822	12.352	0.001*
	Position	2	2.584	5.483	0.006*
	Interaction	2	4.037	8.566	0.000*
15. Assists teachers to improve their classroom atmosphere.	Area	1	1.219	1.899	0.172
	Position	2	5.702	8.882	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.344	0.536	0.587
16. Maintains appropriate staff evaluation records.	Area	1	0.330	0.786	0.378
	Position	2	6.146	14.634	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.059	2.523	0.086

Table 9 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
17. Arranges for individual inservice based on teacher self-evaluation.	Area	1	0.001	0.001	0.978
	Position	2	5.010	3.762	0.027*
	Interaction	2	0.547	0.411	0.664
18. Trains other members of the staff to assume leadership roles in the inservice program.	Area	1	3.594	6.912	0.010*
	Position	2	11.447	22.016	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.416	0.799	0.453
19. Recommends teachers for retention, promotion, or dismissal.	Area	1	0.031	0.067	0.796
	Position	2	5.974	13.029	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.008	0.018	0.982
20. Regularly reviews written lesson plans.	Area	1	13.451	8.226	0.005*
	Position	2	11.733	7.175	0.001*
	Interaction	2	0.094	0.058	0.944
21. Regularly visits all classrooms to observe teaching behavior.	Area	1	3.358	5.432	0.022*
	Position	2	3.424	5.539	0.005*
	Interaction	2	0.328	0.530	0.590
22. Provides feedback to teachers concerning their teaching performance.	Area	1	1.817	3.961	0.050*
	Position	2	1.335	2.910	0.060
	Interaction	2	0.639	1.393	0.254

Table 9 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
23. Assists teachers to evaluate their instruction.	Area	1	2.805	5.014	0.016*
	Position	2	1.210	2.593	0.080
	Interaction	2	1.394	2.988	0.055
24. Assists teachers to adjust their educational program to individual student needs, abilities, and learning styles.	Area	1	2.914	7.240	0.009*
	Position	2	1.183	2.940	0.058
	Interaction	2	2.042	5.073	0.008*
25. Arranges for inservice programs based on the needs of the staff.	Area	1	0.106	0.153	0.696
	Position	2	4.854	7.035	0.001*
	Interaction	2	1.805	2.616	0.079
26. Guides individual teachers toward selective participation in inservice activities based on his/her evaluation of their inservice needs.	Area	1	0.017	0.027	0.870
	Position	2	6.039	9.289	0.000*
	Interaction	2	3.270	5.030	0.009*
27. Evaluates inservice programs.	Area	1	0.757	0.926	0.339
	Position	2	5.159	6.310	0.003*
	Interaction	2	0.803	0.982	0.379
28. Assists teachers to establish meaningful goals and objectives for classroom learning.	Area	1	0.054	0.097	0.756
	Position	2	4.847	8.687	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.600	2.866	0.062

Table 9 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
29. Assists teachers to plan effectively for instruction.	Area	1	1.002	1.333	0.251
	Position	2	5.870	7.806	0.001*
	Interaction	2	1.354	1.801	0.171
30. Assists teachers in developing satisfactory student growth in basic skills.	Area	1	0.107	0.116	0.734
	Position	2	0.870	0.941	0.304
	Interaction	2	2.271	2.456	0.091
31. Provides for variety in inservice activities including visitations, demonstrations, conferences, resource personnel, etc.	Area	1	0.738	1.027	0.313
	Position	2	1.037	1.444	0.241
	Interaction	2	0.480	0.669	0.515
32. Participates in school-wide inservice sessions as leader or audience.	Area	1	2.447	2.213	0.140
	Position	2	0.029	0.026	0.974
	Interaction	2	6.131	5.543	0.005*
33. Maintains professional library for teacher use.	Area	1	0.968	0.669	0.415
	Position	2	0.454	0.314	0.731
	Interaction	2	3.486	2.410	0.095

* Significant at the .05 level.

Table 10

The Principal and Instructional Supervision
ANOVA Results: Summary of Relative Importance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
Area	1	1.138	3.817	0.052*
Position	2	4.342	14.564	0.000*
Interaction	2	0.450	1.511	0.223

* Significant at the .05 level.

Table 11

The Principal and Instructional Supervision
ANOVA Results: Preferred Evaluator

Evaluator	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Sign. of F
Superintendent	Area	1	0.394	1.122	0.290
	Position	2	8.501	24.238	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.892	5.395	0.005*
Principal	Area	1	1.193	3.643	0.057
	Position	2	5.791	17.685	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.982	6.054	0.003*
Teacher	Area	1	5.576	19.088	0.000*
	Position	2	12.144	41.570	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.082	0.282	0.754

* Significant at the .05 level.

Preferred method of evaluation. A two-way analysis of variance was performed for the Instructional Supervision category of competencies to determine the preferred method of evaluation of the

performance of the elementary school principal. No significant differences were found between area group perceptions of the preferred method of evaluation. Superintendents indicated that "a conference between the superintendent and principal," "superintendent observation of the principal," and "superintendent observation of records" were acceptable methods of evaluation significantly more often than did teachers. Teachers felt that a "conference between the superintendent and teachers" was an acceptable method of evaluation significantly more often than did superintendents. These data are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

The Principal and Instructional Supervision
ANOVA Results: Preferred Method of Evaluation

Method of Evaluation	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Sign. of F
Superintendent/ Teacher Conference	Area	1	1.228	3.439	0.065
	Position	2	12.913	36.172	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.054	2.954	0.054*
Superintendent/ Principal Conference	Area	1	0.580	1.694	0.194
	Position	2	11.686	34.120	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.032	0.094	0.910
Superintendent Observation of Principal	Area	1	0.596	2.336	0.128
	Position	2	4.059	15.927	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.809	3.174	0.043*
Superintendent Observation of Records	Area	1	0.170	0.570	0.451
	Position	2	8.657	29.074	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.916	3.076	0.048*

* Significant at the .05 level.

The Principal and the Staff

A total of twenty-six specific competencies of the principal in dealing with the staff were included in this category. The respondents indicated the relative importance of the competency, identified the preferred evaluator, and selected the preferred method of evaluation.

Competency rank. A rank ordering of the specific competencies in this category was performed to determine which competencies were considered most important by area and position groups. Both area and position groups ranked the "encouragement of staff participation in community affairs" lowest in importance. Urban and suburban groups ranked the following competencies exactly the same in importance: "availability of principal to confer with staff" (second), "willingness to confer with staff on school problems" (seventh), "giving recognition to staff" (eighth), "communicating parent advisory group decisions to staff" (twelfth), "distributing non-teaching duties equitably" (sixteenth), and "delegating tasks to staff members" (twenty-third). A review of Table 13 shows the inconsistency of rankings among all other competencies.

Relative importance. A two-way analysis of variance was performed to determine significant differences between and among position and area groups in their perceptions of the relative importance of each competency in this category. Area group perceptions differed significantly for nine of the twenty-six competencies. Urban groups rated the following competencies higher in importance than suburban groups: "assignment of staff based on skill and preference,"

Table 13

The Principal and the Staff
Rank Order of Competency Importance*

Competency	Rank Order					
	All Groups	Urb.	Sub.	Supt.	Prin.	Tchrs.
1. Makes staff members feel important	1	1	3	1	3	4
2. Is available for conferences	2	2	2	4	1	5
3. Follows up on staff concerns	3	9	1	7	8	3
4. Interviews/recommends new staff	4	6	4	3	5	10
5. Encourages staff participation in program	5	5	6	5	6	9
6. Confers with staff on school problems	6	7	7	8	11	6
7. Gives recognition to staff	7	8	8	9	10	8
8. Limits time of staff meetings	8	11	5	10	14	1
9. Assigns staff on basis of skills	9	3	11	2	19	7
10. Does not violate contract	10	4	14	13	4	11
11. Provides for staff articulation	11	13	9	6	13	14
12. Communicates parent advisory decisions	12	12	12	11	7	17
13. Includes staff in designing evaluation	13	17	10	14	15	13
14. Uses staff ideas in problem-solving	14	14	15	15	9	18
15. Seeks/accepts staff criticism/advice	15	10	20	22	2	16
16. Publishes memos for routine decisions	16	15	18	20	23	2
17. Distributes non-teaching duties equitably	17	16	16	12	17	20
18. Prepares/follows staff meeting agenda	18	20	13	21	18	12
19. Clarifies staff authority/responsibility	19	22	17	17	16	22
20. Uses staff meetings to improve program	20	18	22	16	12	23
21. Defines role requirements for positions	21	19	21	18	22	19
22. Orients new staff members	22	24	19	24	24	21

*Presented in order of highest to lowest importance.

Table 13 (continued)

Competency	Rank Order					
	All Groups	Urb.	Sub.	Supt.	Prin.	Tchrs.
23. Establishes curriculum committees	23	21	24	23	21	15
24. Delegates tasks to staff	24	23	23	19	20	24
25. Encourages staff participation in community	25	25	25	25	25	25

* Presented in order of highest to lowest importance.

"acceptance of staff criticism and advice," "establishment of curriculum committees," and "avoidance of contract violations." Suburban groups rated the following competencies higher in importance than urban groups: "allowing for staff participation in the selection of new staff members," "orienting new staff," "following up on staff concerns," "limiting the length of staff meetings," and "delegating tasks to staff."

Position groups differed significantly in their perceptions of the relative importance of competencies for nineteen of the competencies. Teachers rated the "assignment of staff based on skill and preference," the "acceptance of staff criticism," the "establishment of curriculum committees," "staff participation in new staff selection," "limiting staff meeting length," and "publishing routine decisions by memo," higher than did principals. Teachers rated the following competencies higher than did superintendents: "using staff ideas in problem-solving," the "avoidance of contract violations," "following up on staff concerns," "being available for conferences with staff," "conferring with staff on school problems and programs," "preparing and following a relevant staff meeting agenda," and "recognizing staff accomplishments." Principals differed from teachers and superintendents in giving the "clarification of staff authority and responsibility" and the "communication of parent advisory group decisions" higher ratings. These data are presented in Table 14.

A summary of the relative importance of all of the competencies within the general category of The Principal and the Staff was performed using a two-way analysis of variance. Significant differences were found among the three groups--principals, teachers,

Table 14

The Principal and the Staff
ANOVA Results: Relative Importance

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
34. Defines specific role requirements for position vacancies when they occur.	Area	1	0.396	0.407	0.525
	Position	2	1.532	1.575	0.213
	Interaction	2	0.234	0.240	0.787
35. Assigns staff according to the skills, abilities, and preferences of staff members.	Area	1	2.150	7.741	0.007*
	Position	2	2.693	9.695	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.115	0.415	0.662
36. Seeks and accepts staff criticism and advice on his/her performance as principal.	Area	1	3.351	4.644	0.034*
	Position	2	9.581	13.280	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.174	1.628	0.202
37. Establishes curriculum committees to plan for the use of instructional materials.	Area	1	7.225	7.394	0.008*
	Position	2	3.762	3.851	0.025*
	Interaction	2	1.547	1.583	0.211
38. Uses staff ideas and opinions constructively in problem-solving.	Area	1	0.351	0.630	0.430
	Position	2	2.911	5.223	0.007*
	Interaction	2	0.372	0.668	0.516

Table 14 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
39. Utilizes staff meetings as an opportunity to improve the instructional program.	Area	1	0.772	0.914	0.342
	Position	2	3.636	4.305	0.016*
	Interaction	2	0.070	0.083	0.920
40. Is aware of the provisions of staff contracts and does not violate them.	Area	1	3.804	12.644	0.001*
	Position	2	3.781	12.624	0.000*
	Interaction	2	7.729	12.548	0.000*
41. Clarifies the authority and responsibilities of each staff member.	Area	1	0.984	2.139	0.147
	Position	2	2.446	5.319	0.007*
	Interaction	2	2.047	4.451	0.014*
42. Communicates to staff decisions and recommendations made at parent advisory committee meetings.	Area	1	0.010	0.020	0.887
	Position	2	2.190	4.455	0.014*
	Interaction	2	1.787	3.634	0.030*
43. Allows for staff participation in the selection of new staff members.	Area	1	8.524	7.315	0.008*
	Position	2	12.715	10.912	0.000*
	Interaction	2	2.559	2.196	0.117
44. Provides for the orientation of new staff members to the district, the school, the students, and the community.	Area	1	9.487	10.051	0.002*
	Position	2	1.930	2.044	0.136
	Interaction	2	3.283	3.478	0.035*

Table 14 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
45. Promptly follows up on staff recommendations, concerns, or complaints.	Area	1	2.682	8.980	0.004*
	Position	2	1.415	4.738	0.011*
	Interaction	2	0.442	1.479	0.233
46. Includes staff in designing methods for evaluating the curriculum.	Area	1	0.944	1.606	0.208
	Position	2	1.624	2.763	0.609
	Interaction	2	0.030	0.052	0.950
47. Begins staff meetings on time and limits them to a reasonable length.	Area	1	1.263	4.932	0.029*
	Position	2	3.457	13.499	0.000*
	Interaction	2	2.633	10.282	0.000*
48. Publishes in memorandum form routine decisions or announcements.	Area	1	0.771	2.272	0.135
	Position	2	12.648	37.273	0.000*
	Interaction	2	3.610	10.638	0.000*
49. Encourages staff participation in community affairs.	Area	1	2.854	2.269	0.136
	Position	2	8.279	6.583	0.002*
	Interaction	2	2.305	1.833	0.166
50. Provides for equitable distribution of non-teaching duties among staff members.	Area	1	0.127	0.195	0.660
	Position	2	0.256	0.393	0.676
	Interaction	2	4.364	6.702	0.002*

Table 14 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
51. Delegates tasks to staff members.	Area	1	4.189	4.580	0.035*
	Position	2	9.494	10.381	0.000*
	Interaction	2	6.529	7.139	0.001*
52. Interviews prospective staff members and makes recommendations for employment of personnel.	Area	1	0.210	0.674	0.414
	Position	2	0.394	1.263	0.288
	Interaction	2	0.141	0.451	0.638
53. Is readily available for conferences with staff members.	Area	1	0.002	0.011	0.915
	Position	2	1.777	9.434	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.509	2.700	0.072
54. Encourages staff participation in the development of the instructional program.	Area	1	0.001	0.005	0.941
	Position	2	0.771	3.055	0.052*
	Interaction	2	0.018	0.071	0.932
55. Confers with staff concerning new and existing school problems.	Area	1	0.114	0.383	0.538
	Position	2	1.422	4.790	0.010*
	Interaction	2	0.109	0.368	0.693
56. Prepares and follows a relevant agenda for staff meetings.	Area	1	0.827	1.572	0.213
	Position	2	6.306	11.981	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.280	2.431	0.094

Table 14 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
57. Gives recognition to staff members for noteworthy accomplishments.	Area	1	0.041	0.127	0.722
	Position	2	1.695	5.218	0.007*
	Interaction	2	0.719	2.213	0.115
58. Makes staff members feel important and needed.	Area	1	0.039	0.196	0.659
	Position	2	0.325	1.617	0.204
	Interaction	2	0.065	0.321	0.726
59. Provides for continuous articulation among and between staff members involved in the instruction, testing, or counseling of students.	Area	1	0.666	1.752	0.189
	Position	2	0.005	0.013	0.987
	Interaction	2	0.430	1.133	0.327

* Significant at the .05 level.

and superintendents. Superintendents rated all of these competencies significantly less important than did principals and teachers. These results are presented in Table 15.

Table 15

The Principal and the Staff
ANOVA Results: Summary of Relative Importance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
Area	1	0.030	0.140	0.709
Position	2	3.095	14.453	0.000*
Interaction	2	0.581	2.714	0.68

* Significant at the .05 level.

Preferred evaluator. A two-way analysis of variance was performed for the third general category of competencies to determine who the preferred evaluator of the performance of the elementary school principal in relation to his/her staff was. Area group perceptions differed significantly for preferred evaluator "teacher;" urban groups indicated that teacher participation was appropriate more often than did suburban groups. Significant differences were found in position group perceptions of preferred evaluator for all three categories of evaluators. Superintendents and principals felt that they should be included more often than teachers did, while teachers felt that their own participation in the evaluation of these principal competencies was appropriate more often than did both superintendents and principals. These data are presented in Table 16.

Table 16

The Principal and the Staff
ANOVA Results: Preferred Evaluator

Evaluator	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Sign. of F
Superintendent	Area	1	0.176	0.485	0.487
	Position	2	6.417	17.714	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.360	3.755	0.025*
Principal	Area	1	0.792	2.020	0.156
	Position	2	5.663	14.451	0.000*
	Interaction	2	2.771	7.072	0.001*
Teacher	Area	1	5.193	16.825	0.000*
	Position	2	10.513	34.059	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.253	0.819	0.442

* Significant at the .05 level.

Preferred method of evaluation. A two-way analysis of variance was performed to determine the preferred method of evaluation of the performance of the elementary school principal in the area of staff. Area group perceptions differed significantly in two instances; urban groups indicated that "superintendent/teacher conferences" and "superintendent observation of records" were acceptable methods more often than did suburban groups. Superintendents indicated that a "conference between the superintendent and the principal," "superintendent observation of the principal," and "superintendent observation of records" were acceptable methods of evaluation significantly more often than did teachers. Teachers, on the other hand, indicated that a "conference between the superintendent and teachers" was an acceptable method significantly more often than did both principals and superintendents.

These data are presented in Table 17.

Table 17

The Principal and the Staff
ANOVA Results: Preferred Method of Evaluation

Method of Evaluation	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Sign. of F
Superintendent/ Teacher Conference	Area	1	4.891	13.078	0.000*
	Position	2	13.366	35.739	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.231	0.616	0.541
Superintendent/ Principal Conference	Area	1	0.049	0.120	0.729
	Position	2	15.993	39.074	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.348	0.850	0.429
Superintendent Observation of Principal	Area	1	0.124	0.404	0.526
	Position	2	4.596	14.916	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.927	3.007	0.051*
Superintendent Observation of Records	Area	1	2.253	8.912	0.003*
	Position	2	4.373	17.294	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.988	3.906	0.021*

* Significant at the .05 level.

The Principal and the Students

A total of sixteen specific competencies of the principal were included in the category of The Principal and the Students. The respondents indicated the relative importance of the competency, identified the preferred evaluator, and selected the preferred method of evaluation.

Competency rank. A rank ordering of the specific competencies in this category was performed to determine which competencies were

considered most important by area and position groups. Position and area groups ranked the "provision for student participation in the curriculum" lowest in importance. Urban and suburban groups both ranked the "availability of the principal for conferences with students" fifth in importance and the "provision for specialist help for students" sixth in importance. A review of Table 18 shows the inconsistency of rankings among all other competencies.

Relative importance. A two-way analysis of variance was performed to discover significant differences between and among position and area groups in their perceptions of the relative importance of each competency. Area group perceptions differed significantly for four of the sixteen competencies in this category. Suburban groups rated all four of the following competencies higher than urban groups: "maintaining appropriate student records," "providing for access to student records," "ensuring student counseling services," and "seeking parental involvement in student problems."

Position group perceptions differed significantly for eight of the competencies. Principals rated the "principal's availability to students" and his/her "provision for a representative student council" higher than did superintendents and teachers. Teachers rated the "ensuring of appropriate information in student folders" higher than superintendents. Both principals and teachers rated the following competencies higher than superintendents: "establishing and enforcing student conduct standards," "recognizing student achievement," and "providing counseling and/or specialist assistance." These data are presented in Table 19.

Table 18

The Principal and the Students
Rank Order of Competency Importance*

Competency	Rank Order					
	All Groups	Urb.	Sub.	Supt.	Prin.	Tchrs.
1. Disciplines effectively	1	1	2	5	1	1
2. Establishes student conduct standards	2	2	1	2	3	2
3. Maintains student records	3	7	3	1	4	8
4. Provides for adequate supervision	4	3	4	4	5	4
5. Is available to students	5	5	5	7	2	9
6. Provides specialist help	6	6	6	10	8	3
7. Provides for student recognition	7	4	10	9	6	6
8. Makes student records accessible	8	8	7	3	9	11
9. Seeks parental help with problems	9	9	8	6	10	10
10. Provides for student counseling	10	10	9	13	7	5
11. Ensures adequate information in folders	11	11	12	12	12	7
12. Generates solutions to student problems	12	13	11	11	11	12
13. Provides for safekeeping of records	13	12	14	14	14	13
14. Has written retention policy	14	14	15	8	15	15
15. Has representative student council	15	15	13	15	13	14
16. Lets students participate in curriculum	16	16	16	16	16	16

* Presented in order of highest to lowest importance.

Table 19

The Principal and the Students
ANOVA Results: Relative Importance

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
60. Maintains student records in accordance with established Board of Education policy and state and federal laws.	Area	1	3.667	6.071	0.016*
	Position	2	1.109	1.836	0.165
	Interaction	2	0.832	1.377	0.258
61. Makes student records easily accessible to authorized personnel.	Area	1	3.890	6.541	0.012*
	Position	2	0.208	0.349	0.706
	Interaction	2	0.383	0.644	0.528
62. Is generally available to students and willing to discuss their interests and concerns.	Area	1	0.407	0.683	0.411
	Position	2	4.564	7.652	0.001*
	Interaction	2	0.142	0.238	0.788
63. Generates solutions to individual student problems.	Area	1	1.455	1.236	0.269
	Position	2	1.055	0.896	0.412
	Interaction	2	10.185	8.649	0.000*
64. Makes provision for a representative student council.	Area	1	1.763	1.282	0.261
	Position	2	5.606	4.076	0.020*
	Interaction	2	10.092	7.338	0.001*

Table 19 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
65. Employs a written policy concerning student promotion and retention.	Area	1	0.028	0.018	0.894
	Position	2	3.936	2.555	0.083
	Interaction	2	3.080	1.999	0.141
66. Ensures that student folders contain adequate and appropriate information.	Area	1	0.002	0.003	0.957
	Position	2	2.304	3.412	0.037*
	Interaction	2	3.097	4.587	0.013*
67. Helps to establish standards for student conduct, in cooperation with teachers and parents.	Area	1	0.414	1.169	0.203
	Position	2	2.653	7.490	0.001*
	Interaction	2	0.804	2.270	0.109
68. Makes it possible for each student to receive necessary guidance and counseling.	Area	1	3.774	9.238	0.003*
	Position	2	7.350	17.992	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.305	0.748	0.476
69. Seeks parental involvement in the solution of student problems.	Area	1	3.702	6.160	0.015*
	Position	2	0.016	0.027	0.974
	Interaction	2	0.607	1.011	0.368
70. Makes it possible for students to participate in planning the curriculum.	Area	1	1.651	1.240	0.268
	Position	2	0.978	0.735	0.482
	Interaction	2	3.535	2.656	0.076

Table 19 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
71. Provides for the safekeeping of the permanent records of students.	Area	1	1.335	1.554	0.216
	Position	2	2.305	2.682	0.074
	Interaction	2	0.917	1.067	0.348
72. Takes effective action on discipline matters requiring his/her intervention.	Area	1	0.175	1.161	0.284
	Position	2	5.381	35.793	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.190	1.266	0.287
73. Provides the aid of professional specialists for students with special problems.	Area	1	0.756	1.742	0.190
	Position	2	5.812	13.387	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.577	1.330	0.270
74. Provides for the periodic recognition of students who achieve excellence in the various areas of school life.	Area	1	0.070	0.169	0.682
	Position	2	3.550	8.584	0.000*
	Interaction	2	2.667	6.449	0.002*
75. Provides for adequate and continuous supervision of student activities during noon hours and recess periods.	Area	1	0.023	0.043	0.837
	Position	2	0.641	1.169	0.315
	Interaction	2	1.342	2.449	0.092

* Significant at the .05 level.

A summary of the relative importance of all of the competencies within the general category of The Principal and the Students was performed using a two-way analysis of variance. Significant differences were found between the responses of principals and teachers, and the responses of superintendents. Principals and teachers felt that the competencies were more important than did superintendents. These results are presented in Table 20.

Table 20

The Principal and the Students
ANOVA Results: Summary of Relative Importance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
Area	1	0.527	1.486	0.224
Position	2	2.992	8.435	0.000*
Interaction	2	0.180	0.508	0.602

* Significant at the .05 level.

Preferred evaluator. A two-way analysis of variance was performed for the Student category of competencies to determine who the preferred evaluator of the performance of the elementary school principal in this area was. Area group perceptions of preferred evaluator differed significantly for preferred evaluator "teacher;" urban groups felt that teachers should be included more often than suburban groups. Position group perceptions of preferred evaluator differed significantly for all three categories of evaluators. Principals and superintendents felt that they should be included in the evaluation

more often than teachers did. Teachers felt that their own participation was appropriate more often than did principals. These data are presented in Table 21.

Table 21

The Principal and the Students
ANOVA Results: Preferred Evaluator

Evaluator	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Sign. of F
Superintendent	Area	1	1.081	2.319	0.129
	Position	2	5.837	12.518	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.598	1.282	0.279
Principal	Area	1	1.208	3.005	0.084
	Position	2	3.069	7.635	0.001*
	Interaction	2	2.526	6.284	0.002*
Teacher	Area	1	1.543	5.499	0.020*
	Position	2	7.534	26.846	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.094	0.334	0.716

* Significant at the .05 level.

Preferred method of evaluation. A two-way analysis of variance was performed for the Student section of the survey to determine the preferred method of evaluation of the performance of the elementary school principal in this area. Urban groups indicated that the methods "superintendent/teacher conference" and "superintendent observation of records" were acceptable significantly more often than did suburban groups. Superintendents indicated that the methods "superintendent/principal conference," "superintendent observation of principal," and "superintendent observation of records" were acceptable significantly

more often than did teachers. Teachers indicated that a "conference between themselves and the superintendent" was an acceptable method significantly more often than did superintendents. These data are presented in Table 22.

Table 22

The Principal and the Students
ANOVA Results: Preferred Method of Evaluation

Method of Evaluation	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Sign. of F
Superintendent/ Teacher Conference	Area	1	3.911	9.880	0.002*
	Position	2	3.195	8.070	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.365	0.922	0.399
Superintendent/ Principal Conference	Area	1	0.007	0.016	0.898
	Position	2	12.422	28.543	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.472	1.084	0.340
Superintendent Observation of Principal	Area	1	0.162	0.470	0.494
	Position	2	2.655	7.718	0.001*
	Interaction	2	0.175	0.508	0.602
Superintendent Observation of Records	Area	1	1.428	4.686	0.031*
	Position	2	3.499	11.486	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.002	0.008	0.992

* Significant at the .05 level.

The Principal and Financial/Physical Resources

A total of nineteen specific competencies were included in the area of The Principal and Financial/Physical Resources. The respondents indicated the relative importance of the competency, identified the preferred evaluator, and selected the preferred method of evaluation.

Competency rank. A rank ordering of the specific competencies in this category was performed to determine which competencies were considered most important by area and position groups. Position groups did not rank any of the competencies exactly the same in importance. Both urban and suburban groups ranked "operating within budget," "following district accounting procedures," "keeping abreast of school finance laws," and "reporting expenditures to parents" exactly the same in importance. A review of Table 23 shows the inconsistency among all other competency rankings.

Relative importance. A two-way analysis of variance was performed to determine significant differences between and among area and position groups in their perceptions of the relative importance of each competency in this category. Area group perceptions differed significantly for five of the nineteen survey items. Urban groups rated "the legal expenditure of categorical funds" higher than suburban groups. Suburban groups rated the "maintenance of an accurate inventory," the "development of a budget based on staff priorities," the "provision of care for specialist areas," and "periodic safety checks of buildings and grounds" higher in importance than did suburban groups.

Position group perceptions of relative importance differed significantly for eight of the competencies in this category. Teachers rated the "establishment of a budget based on staff priorities," "following district accounting procedures," and "keeping abreast of school finance laws" higher than did superintendents and principals. Teachers also rated the "provision of care for special areas," the "establishment of a storage, accessibility, and repair system for

Table 23

The Principal and Financial/Physical Resources
Rank Order of Competency Importance*

Competency	Rank Order					
	All Groups	Urb.	Sub.	Supt.	Prin.	Tchrs.
1. Corrects unsafe conditions	1	2	1	1	1	3
2. Operates within budget	2	3	3	5	2	4
3. Spends categorical funds legally	3	1	8	3	3	14
4. Keeps accurate financial records	4	4	6	2	4	11
5. Follows purchasing procedures	5	6	4	4	7	7
6. Checks periodically for safety	6	9	2	6	6	2
7. Budgets according to staff/parent priorities	7	5	9	7	5	5
8. Budgets according to staff priorities	8	12	5	8	9	8
9. Follows district accounting procedures	9	10	10	9	14	1
10. Provides teacher work/relax room	10	8	11	13	10	6
11. Enforces use of materials policies	11	11	12	10	8	16
12. Supervises custodial personnel	12	7	16	12	13	13
13. Maintains equipment inventory	13	16	7	11	17	10
14. Provides storage/accessibility system	14	13	14	14	11	15
15. Establishes system: repair/replacement	15	14	15	16	16	12
16. Provides for use/care of special areas	16	17	13	17	15	9
17. Attends to school appearance	17	15	17	15	12	18
18. Keeps abreast of school finance laws	18	18	18	19	18	17
19. Reports expenditures to parents	19	19	19	18	19	19

* Presented in order of highest to lowest importance.

materials," the "provision of a teacher work area," and "the maintenance of an accurate inventory" higher than did principals. These data are presented in Table 24.

A summary of the relative importance of all of the competencies in the category of Financial/Physical Resources was performed using a two-way analysis of variance. Significant differences were found between the responses of teachers and superintendents; teachers rated these competencies higher in importance than did superintendents. These results are presented in Table 25.

Table 25

The Principal and Financial/Physical Resources
ANOVA Results: Summary of Relative Importance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
Area	1	0.137	0.321	0.572
Position	2	5.732	13.470	0.000*
Interaction	2	1.208	2.838	0.060

* Significant at the .05 level.

Preferred evaluator. A two-way analysis of variance was performed for the Financial/Physical Resources category of competencies to determine who the preferred evaluator of the performance of the elementary school principal in this area was. Area group perceptions differed significantly in two instances. Urban groups indicated that the inclusion of the superintendent and of teachers was appropriate more often than did suburban groups. Position group perceptions of preferred evaluator differed significantly in every instance.

Table 24

The Principal and Financial/Physical Resources
ANOVA Results: Relative Importance

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
76. Provides for the keeping of accurate records of all school monies received and spent.	Area	1	1.712	1.543	0.217
	Position	2	0.633	0.571	0.567
	Interaction	2	8.232	7.418	0.001*
77. Purchases services and materials in accordance with established budget procedures.	Area	1	0.025	0.039	0.844
	Position	2	0.828	1.259	0.289
	Interaction	2	1.043	1.586	0.210
78. Ensures that funds allocated to the school for categorical projects are spent according to the regulations of such projects.	Area	1	8.324	14.008	0.000*
	Position	2	1.314	2.211	0.116
	Interaction	2	1.832	3.083	0.057
79. Interviews, assigns, and supervises custodial personnel to provide a physical environment that will enhance instruction.	Area	1	2.948	2.947	0.089
	Position	2	2.073	2.072	0.132
	Interaction	2	1.861	1.860	0.162
80. Ensures that unsatisfactory, unsafe, or unsanitary conditions are corrected promptly.	Area	1	0.059	0.161	0.689
	Position	2	0.689	1.890	0.157
	Interaction	2	0.840	2.304	1.106

Table 24 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
81. Provides a workable system for storage and accessibility of materials.	Area	1	0.391	0.901	0.345
	Position	2	2.617	6.025	0.004*
	Interaction	2	0.884	2.035	0.137
82. Ensures that school policies regarding use of equipment and materials and standards of cleanliness are followed.	Area	1	0.016	0.016	0.899
	Position	2	0.951	0.942	0.393
	Interaction	2	0.149	0.148	0.863
83. Formulates the school budget based on school priorities as determined by the staff.	Area	1	3.236	4.189	0.030*
	Position	2	2.513	4.853	0.027*
	Interaction	2	0.746	3.769	0.331
84. Maintains a bookkeeping and accounting system to meet district requirements.	Area	1	0.217	0.372	0.543
	Position	2	6.238	10.697	0.000*
	Interaction	2	3.330	5.711	0.005*
85. Keeps abreast of new laws related to the area of school finance.	Area	1	0.259	0.234	0.629
	Position	2	25.839	23.413	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.922	1.742	0.181
86. Sees that buildings and grounds are checked periodically for safety.	Area	1	8.502	18.255	0.000*
	Position	2	0.764	1.641	0.200
	Interaction	2	2.349	5.045	0.008*

Table 24 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
87. Makes adequate provision for the use and care of special service areas, such as conference rooms, faculty room, storage areas, etc.	Area	1	5.334	10.753	0.001*
	Position	2	13.345	26.904	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.558	1.124	0.330
88. Maintains an accurate inventory of supplies and equipment.	Area	1	10.212	16.504	0.000*
	Position	2	4.015	6.489	0.002*
	Interaction	2	0.335	0.542	0.583
89. Formulates the school budget based on school priorities as determined by the staff and the parents.	Area	1	2.100	2.221	0.140
	Position	2	1.611	1.704	0.188
	Interaction	2	0.528	0.558	0.574
90. Operates the school program within the allocated budget.	Area	1	0.007	0.014	0.905
	Position	2	0.793	1.574	0.213
	Interaction	2	0.076	0.150	0.861
91. Makes periodic reports to the parents about school expenditures.	Area	1	0.004	0.002	0.962
	Position	2	1.557	1.000	0.372
	Interaction	2	5.728	3.678	0.029*
92. Gives consistent attention to improving interior and exterior school appearance.	Area	1	0.095	0.079	0.779
	Position	2	2.278	1.894	0.156
	Interaction	2	0.117	0.097	0.908

Table 24 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
93. Ensures that adequate space in which to work and relax is set aside for use by staff members.	Area	1	0.330	0.472	0.494
	Position	2	6.135	8.774	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.837	1.198	0.307
94. Establishes procedures for replacement and repair of equipment.	Area	1	0.193	0.287	0.593
	Position	2	6.788	10.131	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.212	0.316	0.730

* Significant at the .05 level.

Superintendents indicated that they should be included more often than principals and teachers did, while teachers felt that they themselves should be included more often than did both superintendents and principals. These data are presented in Table 26.

Table 26

The Principal and Financial/Physical Resources
ANOVA Results: Preferred Evaluator

Evaluator	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Sign. of F
Superintendent	Area	1	1.493	4.592	0.033*
	Position	2	4.033	12.401	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.118	3.439	0.033*
Principal	Area	1	0.446	1.194	0.275
	Position	2	5.382	9.064	0.000*
	Interaction	2	2.536	6.796	0.001*
Teacher	Area	1	2.830	15.267	0.000*
	Position	2	3.539	19.090	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.044	0.236	0.790

* Significant at the .05 level.

Preferred method of evaluation. A two-way analysis of variance was performed to determine the preferred method of evaluation of the performance of the elementary school principal in the area of Financial/Physical Resources. Urban groups indicated that "superintendent/teacher conference" was an acceptable method of evaluation significantly more often than did suburban groups. Superintendents and principals indicated that the methods "superintendent/principal conference" and "superintendent observation of records" were acceptable

significantly more often than teachers did, while teachers indicated that a "conference between the superintendent and teachers" was an acceptable method significantly more often than did both superintendents and principals. These data are presented in Table 27.

Table 27

The Principal and Financial/Physical Resources
ANOVA Results: Preferred Method of Evaluation

Method of Evaluation	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Sign. of F
Superintendent/ Teacher Conference	Area	1	2.750	10.378	0.001*
	Position	2	3.273	12.352	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.364	1.373	0.255
Superintendent/ Principal Conference	Area	1	0.969	2.492	0.116
	Position	2	8.707	22.395	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.456	1.173	0.311
Superintendent Observation of Principal	Area	1	0.256	0.800	0.372
	Position	2	0.872	2.726	0.067
	Interaction	2	1.033	3.229	0.041*
Superintendent Observation of Records	Area	1	0.228	0.763	0.383
	Position	2	5.735	19.198	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.308	1.030	0.359

* Significant at the .05 level.

The Principal and the Community

A total of twenty-one specific competencies were included in the area of The Principal and the Community. Respondents indicated the relative importance of the competency, identified the preferred evaluator, and selected the preferred method of evaluation.

Competency rank. A rank ordering of the specific competencies in this category was performed to determine which competencies were considered most important by area and position groups. Position groups did not rank any of the competencies exactly the same. Area group competency rankings were the same for two of the competencies; they ranked the "encouragement of teacher participation in P.T.A." seventeenth in importance, and the "involvement of community in school programs" twentieth in importance. A review of Table 28 shows the inconsistency among all other competency rankings.

Relative importance. A two-way analysis of variance was performed to determine significant differences between and among position and area groups in their perceptions of the relative importance of each competency in this category. Area group perception differed significantly for six of the twenty-one survey items. Urban groups rated the "encouragement of parent involvement in the development of school policies, methods, and techniques" higher than did suburban groups. Suburban groups rated the "availability of the principal for parent conferences," the "organization of special events," and the "initiation of a school calendar" higher than urban groups.

Position groups differed significantly in their perceptions of the relative importance of the competencies in this category for nine of the competencies. Principals rated the following competencies higher than both superintendents and teachers: "providing parent training," "holding meetings in a comfortable environment and at a time convenient to parents," "staying alert to community conditions," and "using community resources in the school program." Superintendents

Table 28

The Principal and the Community
Rank Order of Competency Importance*

Competency	Rank Order					
	All Groups	Urb.	Sub.	Supt.	Prin.	Tchrs.
1. Periodically reports student progress	1	1	2	1	1	2
2. Is available for parent conferences	2	4	1	5	3	1
3. Replies promptly to parent inquiries	3	2	4	2	2	3
4. Keeps community informed	4	5	3	3	4	4
5. Stays alert to community conditions	5	7	5	7	5	5
6. Encourages school advisory group	6	3	8	6	9	6
7. Assesses community expectations	7	8	6	8	10	7
8. Arranges convenient meeting time	8	6	14	10	6	11
9. Arranges comfortable meeting place	9	10	9	12	7	9
10. Provides training for parent groups	10	9	10	9	8	14
11. Involves parents in developing goals	11	12	11	4	11	18
12. Establishes calendar of school activities	12	15	7	18	12	8
13. Analyzes community resources	13	13	15	11	13	16
14. Recruits/trains school volunteers	14	14	16	15	15	13
15. Organizes special events	15	18	13	16	17	12
16. Assists teachers to use community resources	16	16	18	17	14	17
17. Involves community in policy development	17	11	19	14	16	19
18. Involves community in methods/techniques	18	19	12	20	18	10
19. Encourages teacher participation in P.T.A.	19	17	17	13	19	15
20. Involves community in budget development	20	20	20	19	20	20

* Presented in order of highest to lowest importance.

and principals both rated the "principal's ability to involve the community in the development of school policies and goals" higher than teachers. Principals rated the "ensuring of periodic progress reports to parents" higher than did teachers, and the "availability of the principal for parent conferences" higher than did superintendents. These data are presented in Table 29.

A summary of the relative importance of all of the competencies within the general category of The Principal and the Community was performed using a two-way analysis of variance. Principals rated the competencies in dealing with the community significantly higher than did teachers. These results are presented in Table 30.

Table 30

The Principal & the Community
ANOVA Results: Summary of Relative Importance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
Area	1	0.191	0.279	0.598
Position	2	4.565	6.672	0.001*
Interaction	2	0.444	0.649	0.524

* Significant at the .05 level.

Preferred evaluator. A two-way analysis of variance was performed for the "Community" category of competencies to determine who the preferred evaluator of the performance of the elementary school principal in this area was. No significant differences were found between area group perceptions of preferred evaluator of these competencies. Position group perceptions differed significantly in every

Table 29

The Principal and the Community
ANOVA Results: Relative Importance

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
95. Keeps the community well-informed concerning the school's activities, needs, and opportunities.	Area	1	1.455	2.254	0.137
	Position	2	1.704	2.639	0.077
	Interaction	2	2.578	3.992	0.022*
96. Replies to all inquiries from parents and others in the community promptly and courteously.	Area	1	0.458	0.565	0.454
	Position	2	2.300	2.837	0.064
	Interaction	2	0.016	0.019	0.981
97. Surveys and analyzes resources of the community to determine their implications for enriching the educational program.	Area	1	0.521	0.377	0.541
	Position	2	3.816	2.761	0.069
	Interaction	2	1.292	0.935	0.396
98. Encourages a broadly representative and active P.T.A., School Advisory Committee, School Site Council, and/or other school advisory group.	Area	1	2.723	5.083	0.027*
	Position	2	1.155	2.155	0.122
	Interaction	2	3.783	7.061	0.001*
99. Provides parent advisory group members with the training necessary to carry out their functions.	Area	1	0.011	0.013	0.908
	Position	2	7.555	9.464	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.764	0.958	0.388

Table 29 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
100. Arranges for parent advisory group meetings in a relaxed and comfortable environment.	Area	1	0.383	0.548	0.461
	Position	2	4.624	6.614	0.002*
	Interaction	2	0.403	0.577	0.564
101. Arranges for parent advisory group meetings at a time convenient to parents.	Area	1	2.394	2.182	0.143
	Position	2	6.172	5.627	0.005*
	Interaction	2	0.823	0.750	0.475
102. Involves representatives of the total school community in the formulation of school policies.	Area	1	6.830	4.784	0.031*
	Position	2	4.982	3.490	0.035*
	Interaction	2	2.112	1.479	0.233
103. Stays alert to the community and changing conditions that affect the school.	Area	1	1.051	1.390	0.242
	Position	2	2.515	3.326	0.041*
	Interaction	2	0.154	0.204	0.816
104. Assists teachers to utilize community resources in the school program.	Area	1	0.087	0.078	0.781
	Position	2	5.177	4.638	0.012*
	Interaction	2	0.368	0.330	0.720
105. Involves parent advisory groups in the development of school goals.	Area	1	1.208	1.180	0.280
	Position	2	14.028	13.707	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.678	0.662	0.518

Table 29 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
106. Involves parent advisory groups in the development of the school budget.	Area	1	3.382	1.750	0.189
	Position	2	5.288	2.736	0.070
	Interaction	2	6.815	3.526	0.034*
107. Provides for the recruitment and training of school volunteers.	Area	1	0.125	0.182	0.670
	Position	2	0.720	1.048	0.355
	Interaction	2	1.509	2.196	0.117
108. Allows for community participation in the selection of new staff members.	Area	1	0.198	0.160	0.690
	Position	2	0.730	0.591	0.556
	Interaction	2	8.035	6.503	0.002*
109. Is readily available for conferences with parents.	Area	1	2.729	4.999	0.028*
	Position	2	2.039	3.735	0.028*
	Interaction	2	3.590	6.577	0.002*
110. Periodically assesses community expectations and satisfaction with the school programs.	Area	1	0.054	0.082	0.775
	Position	2	0.353	0.542	0.583
	Interaction	2	9.164	14.078	0.000*
111. Organizes special events to stimulate interest in school activities.	Area	1	10.692	15.615	0.000*
	Position	2	0.010	0.014	0.986
	Interaction	2	3.973	5.802	0.004*

Table 29 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
112. Involves parent advisory groups in the development of methods, techniques, and the selection of materials designed to meet school objectives.	Area	1	15.658	8.535	0.004*
	Position	2	3.953	2.155	0.122
	Interaction	2	3.709	2.022	0.138
113. Encourages teachers to take an active part in parent-teacher organizations.	Area	1	2.550	1.705	0.195
	Position	2	2.600	1.738	0.182
	Interaction	2	20.682	13.826	0.000*
114. Ensures that parents are provided with regular, periodic reports concerning their children's progress.	Area	1	0.781	2.024	0.158
	Position	2	1.358	3.516	0.034*
	Interaction	2	0.025	0.064	0.938
115. Initiates, publicizes, and to the extent possible adheres to an annual calendar of school activities.	Area	1	4.671	4.946	0.029*
	Position	2	2.643	2.798	0.066
	Interaction	2	1.392	1.474	0.234

* Significant at the .05 level.

instance. Superintendents indicated that they should be included more often than did both principals and teachers. Principals indicated that their own inclusion was appropriate more often than teachers, while teachers felt that teacher participation was appropriate more often than did principals. These data are presented in Table 31.

Table 31

The Principal and the Community
ANOVA Results: Preferred Evaluator

Evaluator	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Sign. of F
Superintendent	Area	1	0.204	0.506	0.478
	Position	2	4.889	12.142	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.309	0.768	0.465
Principal	Area	1	0.067	0.197	0.658
	Position	2	1.245	3.680	0.026*
	Interaction	2	0.108	0.319	0.727
Teacher	Area	1	0.379	1.458	0.228
	Position	2	3.692	14.188	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.426	5.482	0.005*

* Significant at the .05 level.

Preferred method of evaluation. A two-way analysis of variance was performed for the "Community" category of competencies to determine the preferred method of evaluation of the performance of the elementary school principal in this area. Urban groups indicated that "superintendent observation of records" was an acceptable method of evaluation significantly more often than did suburban groups. Superintendents and principals indicated that the following methods were acceptable

significantly more often than did teachers: "superintendent/principal conference," "superintendent observation of principal," and "superintendent observation of records." Teachers felt that a "conference between themselves and the superintendent" was acceptable significantly more often than did superintendents and principals. These data are presented in Table 32.

Table 32

The Principal and the Community
ANOVA Results: Preferred Method of Evaluation

Method of Evaluation	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Sign. of F
Superintendent/ Teacher Conference	Area	1	0.780	2.608	0.107
	Position	2	2.373	7.938	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.280	0.936	0.393
Superintendent/ Principal Conference	Area	1	0.170	0.385	0.535
	Position	2	7.057	15.943	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.234	0.528	0.590
Superintendent Observation of Principal	Area	1	0.100	0.274	0.601
	Position	2	1.800	4.927	0.008*
	Interaction	2	0.482	1.320	0.269
Superintendent Observation of Records	Area	1	2.723	8.497	0.004*
	Position	2	4.584	14.302	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.034	3.227	0.041*

* Significant at the .05 level.

The Principal and the School System

A total of eleven specific competencies of the principal were included in the "School System" category. The respondents indicated

the relative importance of the competency, identified the preferred evaluator, and selected the preferred method of evaluation.

Competency rank. A rank ordering of the specific competencies in this category was performed to determine which competencies were considered most important by area and position groups. Position groups did not rank any of the competencies exactly the same in importance. Both urban and suburban groups ranked the "awareness of the principal of categorical rules and regulations" fourth in importance. A review of Table 33 shows the inconsistency among all other competency rankings.

Relative importance. A two-way analysis of variance was performed to determine significant differences between and among area and position group perceptions of the relative importance of each competency in this category. Area group perceptions differed significantly for two of the eleven competencies. Suburban groups rated the "implementation of administrative policies" and "attendance at district meetings" higher than did urban groups. Position group perceptions differed significantly for five of the competencies. Superintendents and principals rated the "utilization of administrative recommendations" and "supportiveness of the district administration" higher than teachers. Teachers rated the "interpretation of bilingual education laws to the staff" higher than both principals and superintendents. Both teachers and principals rated the "informing of the staff of administrative policies" higher than superintendents, while superintendents rated the "implementation of administrative policies" higher than both principals and teachers. These data are presented in Table 34.

A summary of the relative importance of all of the competencies

Table 33

The Principal and the School System
Rank Order of Competency Importance*

Competency	Rank Order					
	All Groups	Urb.	Sub.	Supt.	Prin.	Tchrs.
1. Ensures implementation of admin. policies	1	9	1	8	7	4
2. Maintains supportive attitude	2	11	7	1	11	10
3. Submits reports promptly	3	1	5	2	4	1
4. Attends district meetings	4	8	2	5	1	6
5. Is aware of categorical program laws	5	4	4	7	6	2
6. Relays concerns to administration	6	2	3	6	3	3
7. Is aware of special education laws	7	5	8	10	5	9
8. Uses Board recommendations	8	7	10	3	10	7
9. Uses district resources	9	6	9	9	9	8
10. Informs staff of administrative policies	10	3	6	4	2	5
11. Is aware of bilingual education laws	11	10	11	11	8	11

* Presented in order of highest to lowest importance.

Table 34

The Principal and the School System
ANOVA Results: Relative Importance

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
116. Keeps staff informed of administrative and Board of Education policies.	Area	1	1.287	2.821	0.097
	Position	2	4.398	9.639	0.000*
	Interaction	2	2.054	4.502	0.014*
117. Utilizes administrative and Board of Education recommendations in revising educational plans.	Area	1	2.394	3.387	0.069
	Position	2	3.011	4.260	0.017*
	Interaction	2	1.766	2.498	0.088
118. Submits required reports promptly and accurately.	Area	1	0.862	2.669	0.106
	Position	2	0.121	0.375	0.689
	Interaction	2	1.798	5.569	0.005*
119. Is aware of and interprets for the staff legal mandates concerning special education programs.	Area	1	1.798	2.405	0.125
	Position	2	0.496	0.663	0.518
	Interaction	2	0.308	0.412	0.663
120. Ensures that administrative and Board of Education policies are implemented consistently.	Area	1	4.505	5.629	0.020*
	Position	2	3.301	4.124	0.019*
	Interaction	2	4.397	5.491	0.006*

Table 34 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
121. Keeps the district administration and the Board of Education informed of the school's activities.	Area	1	1.559	1.867	0.775
	Position	2	0.596	0.714	0.493
	Interaction	2	7.189	8.609	0.000*
122. Attends and contributes to district meetings where his/her attendance is expected.	Area	1	3.301	4.538	0.036*
	Position	2	0.127	0.175	0.840
	Interaction	2	4.571	6.284	0.003*
123. Is aware of and ensures that legal mandates concerning categorical programs are followed in implementing such programs in the school.	Area	1	0.668	0.692	0.408
	Position	2	1.178	1.219	0.300
	Interaction	2	2.013	2.083	0.131
124. Maintains a supportive attitude toward administrative and Board of Education policies even when they may be contrary to his/her opinions.	Area	1	3.118	3.146	0.079
	Position	2	24.463	24.684	0.000*
	Interaction	2	4.973	5.018	0.009*
125. Promptly relays concerns and recommendations of staff and parents to the central administration.	Area	1	0.068	0.162	0.688
	Position	2	0.143	0.341	0.712
	Interaction	2	1.155	2.753	0.069
126. Is aware of and interprets for the staff legal mandates concerning bilingual education programs.	Area	1	1.241	1.082	0.301
	Position	2	3.554	3.100	0.050*
	Interaction	2	3.627	3.164	0.047*

Table 34 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
127. Utilizes district personnel and materials resources as appropriate in improving the school program.	Area	1	1.562	2.489	0.118
	Position	2	0.650	1.036	0.359
	Interaction	2	0.325	0.518	0.598

* Significant at the .05 level.

in the category of "School System" was performed using a two-way analysis of variance. No significant differences were found by area or position. These results are presented in Table 35.

Table 35

The Principal & the School System
ANOVA Results: Summary of Relative Importance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
Area	1	0.013	0.027	0.869
Position	2	0.450	0.939	0.392
Interaction	2	0.762	1.591	0.206

* Significant at the .05 level.

Preferred evaluator. A two-way analysis of variance was performed for the "School System" category of competencies to determine the preferred evaluator of the performance of the elementary school principal in this area. Area group perceptions of preferred evaluator differed significantly for preferred evaluator "teacher;" urban groups indicated that teacher participation in evaluation was appropriate more often than did suburban groups. Superintendents and principals indicated that they should be included more often than teachers did. Teachers and principals indicated that teacher participation was appropriate more often than did superintendents. These data are presented in Table 36.

Preferred method of evaluation. A two-way analysis of variance was performed to determine the preferred method of evaluation of the

performance of the elementary school principal in the area of "School System." Urban groups indicated that the method "superintendent/teacher conference" was acceptable significantly more often than did suburban groups. Superintendents and principals felt that the following methods were acceptable significantly more often than did teachers: "superintendent/principal conference," "superintendent observation of records," and "superintendent observation of the principal." Teachers indicated that a "conference between themselves and the superintendent" was an acceptable method of evaluation significantly more often than did superintendents. These data are presented in Table 37.

Table 36

The Principal & the School System
ANOVA Results: Preferred Evaluator

Evaluator	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Sign. of F
Superintendent	Area	1	0.152	0.404	0.526
	Position	2	5.721	15.219	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.471	1.254	0.287
Principal	Area	1	0.225	0.597	0.440
	Position	2	4.672	12.424	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.279	3.401	0.035*
Teacher	Area	1	3.233	10.715	0.001*
	Position	2	2.816	9.332	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.233	0.774	0.462

* Significant at the .05 level.

Table 37

The Principal & the School System
ANOVA Results: Preferred Method of Evaluation

Method of Evaluation	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Sign. of F
Superintendent/ Teacher Conference	Area	1	2.705	8.624	0.004*
	Position	2	8.144	25.962	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.686	5.375	0.005*
Superintendent/ Principal Conference	Area	1	0.035	0.093	0.761
	Position	2	10.127	26.558	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.729	4.535	0.012*
Superintendent Observation of Principal	Area	1	0.448	1.006	0.317
	Position	2	5.120	11.507	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.799	1.795	0.168
Superintendent Observation of Records	Area	1	1.237	3.040	0.082
	Position	2	2.218	5.450	0.005*
	Interaction	2	0.074	0.181	0.835

* Significant at the .05 level.

The Principal's Personal and Professional Characteristics

A total of eight specific competencies of the principal were included in the area of the Principal's Personal/Professional Characteristics. The respondents indicated the relative importance of the competency, identified the preferred evaluator, and selected the preferred method of evaluation.

Competency rank. A rank ordering of the specific competencies in this category was performed to determine which competencies were considered most important by area and position groups. Position groups

did not rank any of the competencies exactly the same in importance. The rankings for urban and suburban groups were similar for three of the competencies. Area groups ranked the "principal's ability to grow professionally" fourth in importance, the "principal's ability to keep informed on school law" fifth, and the "principal's use of current educational literature" eighth in importance. A review of Table 38 shows the inconsistency of rankings among all other competencies.

Relative importance. A two-way analysis of variance was performed to determine significant differences between and among position and area groups in their perceptions of the relative importance of each competency in this category. Area group perceptions differed significantly for three of the eight competencies. Suburban groups rated the "clear presentation of ideas" and the "reading of current educational literature" higher than did urban groups. Urban groups rated the "ability to communicate honestly and openly" higher than did suburban groups.

Position group perceptions of the relative importance of these competencies differed significantly in only one instance. Principals rated the ability to grow professionally higher than did both superintendents and teachers. These data are presented in Table 39.

A summary of the relative importance of all of the competencies within the general category of Personal/Professional Characteristics was performed using a two-way analysis of variance. Urban teachers and principals rated these competencies significantly lower than did urban superintendents, while suburban teachers and principals rated them significantly higher than suburban superintendents. These results

Table 38

The Principal's Personal and Professional Characteristics
Rank Order of Competency Importance*

Competency	Rank Order					
	All Groups	Urb.	Sub.	Supt.	Prin.	Tchrs.
1. Communicates openly	1	1	1	2	1	1
2. Is tactful and objective	2	3	2	1	4	2
3. Is consistent	3	2	6	4	2	3
4. Presents ideas clearly	4	7	3	6	5	4
5. Grows professionally	5	4	4	3	6	5
6. Is informed on school law	6	5	5	7	3	6
7. Is punctual	7	6	7	5	7	8
8. Uses current literature	8	8	8	8	8	7

* Presented in order of highest to lowest importance.

Table 39

The Principal's Personal and Professional Characteristics
ANOVA Results: Relative Importance

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
128. Consistently takes advantage of opportunities for his/her own professional growth.	Area	1	0.011	0.033	0.856
	Position	2	1.692	5.250	0.007*
	Interaction	2	1.874	5.815	0.004*
129. Keeps informed about state and federal school laws, rules, and regulations, and their implications for school programs.	Area	1	0.030	0.064	0.800
	Position	2	0.870	1.887	0.157
	Interaction	2	5.310	11.513	0.000*
130. Is consistent in his/her behavior with students, staff, and parents.	Area	1	1.866	2.630	0.108
	Position	2	0.583	0.821	0.443
	Interaction	2	0.520	0.733	0.483
131. Reads current educational literature, disseminates pertinent information to staff, and utilizes such information in educational planning.	Area	1	1.477	4.480	0.037*
	Position	2	0.183	0.789	0.458
	Interaction	2	3.284	6.701	0.002*
132. Is able to present his/her ideas clearly, both orally and in writing.	Area	1	1.350	4.113	0.046*
	Position	2	0.326	0.993	0.375
	Interaction	2	2.246	6.844	0.002*

Table 39 (continued)

Competency	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
133. Practices tactfulness as well as objectivity.	Area	1	0.309	0.862	0.356
	Position	2	0.260	0.726	0.487
	Interaction	2	0.821	2.291	0.107
134. Is punctual in arriving at school, and at school and district meetings.	Area	1	0.232	0.270	0.605
	Position	2	1.181	1.374	0.258
	Interaction	2	0.042	0.049	0.953
135. Demonstrates and encourages open, honest communication throughout the school.	Area	1	1.636	18.272	0.000*
	Position	2	0.163	1.816	0.168
	Interaction	2	0.187	2.086	0.130

* Significant at the .05 level.

are presented in Table 40.

Table 40

The Principal's Personal and Professional Characteristics
ANOVA Results: Summary of Relative Importance

Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Significance of F
Area	1	0.027	0.097	0.756
Position	2	0.211	0.763	0.467
Interaction	2	1.745	6.307	0.002*

* Significant at the .05 level.

Preferred evaluator. A two-way analysis of variance was performed for the "Personal/Professional Characteristics" category of competencies to determine who the preferred evaluator of the performance of the elementary school principal in this area was. No significant differences were found between area group perceptions of preferred evaluator. Superintendents and principals felt that superintendents should be included significantly more often than did teachers. Principals indicated that their own participation was appropriate significantly more often than did both superintendents and teachers. Teachers and principals indicated that teacher participation was appropriate significantly more often than did superintendents. These data are presented in Table 41.

Preferred method of evaluation. A two-way analysis of variance was performed for the Personal/Professional Characteristics category of competencies to determine the preferred method of evaluation of the performance of the elementary school principal in this area. Urban groups

indicated that the method "superintendent/teacher conference" was acceptable significantly more often than did suburban groups. Principals and superintendents indicated that "superintendent/principal conference" and "superintendent observation of records" were acceptable methods significantly more often than teachers. Superintendents indicated that the method "superintendent observation of principal" was acceptable significantly more often than did both principals and teachers. Teachers and principals both indicated that the method "superintendent/teacher conference" was acceptable significantly more often than did superintendents. These data are presented in Table 42.

Table 41

The Principal's Personal and Professional Characteristics
ANOVA Results: Preferred Evaluator

Evaluator	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Sign. of F
Superintendent	Area	1	0.326	0.794	0.374
	Position	2	11.922	29.006	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.086	0.210	0.811
Principal	Area	1	0.952	2.385	0.124
	Position	2	5.205	13.037	0.000*
	Interaction	2	2.657	6.655	0.002*
Teacher	Area	2	0.930	2.325	0.128
	Position	2	11.845	29.621	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.018	0.046	0.955

* Significant at the .05 level.

Table 42

The Principal's Personal & Professional Characteristics
ANOVA Results: Preferred Method of Evaluation

Method of Evaluation	Source of Variation	df	MS	F	Sign. of F
Superintendent/ Teacher Conference	Area	1	8.195	20.824	0.000*
	Position	2	7.413	18.839	0.000*
	Interaction	2	1.624	4.128	0.017*
Superintendent/ Principal Conference	Area	1	0.054	0.111	0.740
	Position	2	7.835	16.099	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.124	0.255	0.775
Superintendent Observation of Principal	Area	1	0.266	0.487	0.486
	Position	2	2.766	5.063	0.007*
	Interaction	2	1.073	1.964	0.142
Superintendent Observation of Records	Area	1	0.105	0.311	0.577
	Position	2	3.530	10.486	0.000*
	Interaction	2	0.307	0.913	0.403

* Significant at the .05 level.

Summary

The findings of the study have been presented in this chapter. A total of 58 percent of the surveys were returned to the investigator in usable form. An analysis of survey results was conducted for each of the general categories of principal competencies. These data were subdivided for each category into four sections: competency rank, relative importance, preferred evaluator, and the preferred method of evaluation.

Rank Order of Importance

As part of the study, several questions were asked regarding

the perceptions of superintendents, principals, and teachers concerning the importance of principal competencies, the preferred evaluator of the principal, and the preferred method of evaluation. The first of these questions concerned the rank order of importance of competencies as perceived by area and position groups. Urban and suburban groups rank-ordered twenty-five (18%) of the competencies exactly the same in importance. Superintendents, teachers, and principals rank-ordered only two (1%) of the competencies exactly the same. All other competencies were ranked differently--often considerably differently, by area and position groups.

Relative Importance

The second question which the study proposed to answer was: How does each area and position group compare regarding their perceptions of the relative importance of each competency? Significant differences between perceptions of area groups were found for thirty-eight (28%) of the competencies. Suburban groups rated twenty-eight (21%) of the competencies higher in importance than did urban groups. Urban groups rated nine of the competencies (6%) higher than did suburban groups. These differences were distributed generally across all categories of competencies.

Significant differences among perceptions of position groups were found for seventy-one (56%) of the competencies. Superintendents rated four of the competencies (1%) higher in importance than did principals, and they rated sixteen of the competencies (12%) higher than did teachers. Principals rated twenty-six of the competencies (19%)

higher than did superintendents, and twenty-five of the competencies (18%) higher than did teachers. Teachers rated thirty-six of the competencies (26%) higher than did superintendents. They also rated fourteen of the competencies (10%) higher than did principals. These differences were distributed generally across all categories of competencies.

Preferred Evaluator

The third question which the study proposed to answer was: How does each area and position group compare regarding their perceptions of who should evaluate these competencies? Significant differences were found between urban and suburban groups for six of the eight categories of competencies. Urban groups felt for all six general categories of competency that teachers should be included significantly more often than did suburban groups. Significant differences were found among perceptions of position groups for all categories of competencies and for all evaluators. These differences displayed a definite pattern. For every category of competencies, superintendents indicated that they were best qualified to evaluate the performance of the elementary school principal while teachers suggested that teachers were best qualified. Principals felt that they were best qualified to evaluate their own performance, a perception which differed from that of teachers for every category of competency.

Preferred Method of Evaluation

The fourth question which the study proposed to answer was: How does each area and position group compare regarding their perceptions of how the competencies should be evaluated? Significant

differences were found for seven of the eight general categories of competencies. These differences displayed a definite pattern. The method "superintendent/teacher conference" was rated higher by urban groups than by suburban groups for five of the competency categories. "Superintendent observation of records" was rated higher by urban groups than by suburban groups for four of the categories.

Significant differences were found among the perceptions of position groups for all categories of competencies and for all methods of evaluation. These differences also displayed a definite pattern. For every category of competency, teachers rated the method "superintendent/teacher conference" higher than did superintendents. Superintendents rated "superintendent/principal conference," "superintendent observation of principal," and "superintendent observation of records," higher than did teachers.

In the following chapter, conclusions will be drawn, recommendations for further research will be offered, and the specific process and instruments for the evaluation of urban and suburban principals will be presented.

Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY

THE EVALUATION SYSTEMS

This chapter is divided into five sections. In the first section, the conclusions drawn from the research are discussed. In the second section, the development of the evaluation systems is presented. The third section contains the evaluation systems for urban and suburban elementary school principals. Considerations for use of the systems are presented in the fourth section, and the fifth section contains recommendations for further study.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the survey data:

1. Superintendents, teachers, and principals perceive the competencies necessary for the principalship role quite differently. There are significant differences in the perceptions of the superintendent, principal, and teacher regarding the relative importance of these competencies.

These differences in perceptions reinforce the concept of the principalship as a position in which the incumbent must satisfactorily meet the varying expectations of the school staff, the superintendent, and his/her own expectations. Conflicting situations may be expected to occur when these expectations are significantly divergent, as they are in 56 percent of the instances as found in this study. In any number

of daily situations with which the principal is confronted, he/she must decide whether to: (1) conform to the expectations of teachers, of the superintendent, or of himself/herself; (2) perform some compromise behavior in an attempt to conform in part to differing expectations; (3) attempt to avoid conforming to any expectations by avoiding the situation; or (4) attempt to change the direction or intensity of expectations of one or more groups. The balancing of diverse expectations for his/her role is perhaps one of the most difficult tasks of the principalship.

2. There are significant differences between superintendents, principals, and teachers, in their perceptions of who should evaluate the competencies of the elementary school principal. These differences exist mainly between superintendents and teachers.

The question of who should evaluate the performance of the elementary school principal was not definitively answered by this study. Teachers indicated that they were most competent to evaluate the elementary school principal since they are most directly affected by his/her performance. Superintendents maintained the traditional view of having the principals evaluated by their supervisors. Often, superintendents have held the position of principal and reflected a position that they could evaluate performance with more understanding and insight than could teachers. Principals, on the other hand, felt that they should definitely be included in the evaluation process. Teachers disagreed, probably because they believed that evaluating one's own performance objectively is very difficult.

3. There are significant differences between superintendents, principals,

and teachers in their perceptions of how the competencies of the principal should be evaluated. These differences exist mainly between superintendents and teachers.

Teachers and superintendents hold significantly different perceptions of acceptable methods of evaluation. Teachers are intimately involved with the day-to-day operations of the school and the effects of the principal's performance, and thus felt that a conference between themselves and the superintendent would be the most satisfactory method of evaluation. Superintendents felt that they could adequately evaluate the principal through conferencing with him/her, observing performance, and/or observing records without teacher input. This is the more traditional view of principal evaluation.

4. There are significant differences between urban and suburban group perceptions of the relative importance of principal competencies.

It is interesting to note that suburban groups rated most competencies in the categories of staff and financial/physical resources higher than did urban groups, while urban groups rated most competencies in the category of community relations higher than did suburban groups. Urban schools are generally mandated by law to establish parent advisory groups and involve them in planning, implementation, and evaluation of categorical projects; this requirement may, in part, explain the increased importance given to "community" competencies by urban groups.

5. There are significant differences between urban and suburban group perceptions of who should evaluate the principal,

Urban groups felt that teachers should be included in

the evaluation process more than did suburban groups. The reason for this difference is not clear. Suburban groups adopted the traditional view of supervisor evaluation, while urban groups were amenable to the inclusion of teachers. This finding may suggest that urban groups recognize the value of teacher opinion in principal evaluation, while suburban groups are either threatened by their inclusion, or feel that teachers are not competent to judge the effectiveness of the elementary school principal's performance.

6. There are significant differences between urban and suburban group perceptions of how the competencies of the principal should be evaluated.

Urban groups were again more amenable than suburban groups to the inclusion of teachers in the evaluation process. The perception of urban groups that superintendent observation of records was an acceptable method of evaluation is perhaps due to the fact that urban groups must, in complying with categorical program requirements, maintain an extensive record-keeping and documentation system. Suburban groups with fewer categorical projects tend to be exempt from these requirements.

In the following section, a system for the evaluation of the elementary school principal will be presented.

The Development of the Systems

The urban and suburban systems for the evaluation of the elementary school principal were developed using the responses of the urban and suburban groups regarding the importance of the competencies,

the evaluator, and the method of evaluation. The details of this development will be discussed in this section.

Competencies Included in the Systems

The competencies included in the systems were those which received a mean perceived importance of at least 3.00 by two of the three position groups (superintendent, principal, or teacher) in the area (urban or suburban). Eight competencies were eliminated from the original list for the urban principal evaluation system. These competencies included: schedules classroom observational visits in advance with the teacher, assists teachers in developing satisfactory student growth in basic skills, maintains a professional library for teacher use, allows for staff participation in the selection of new staff members, encourages staff participation in community affairs, makes it possible for students to participate in curriculum planning, involves parent advisory groups in the development of the school budget, and allows for community participation in the selection of new staff members. Three competencies were eliminated from the original list for the suburban principal evaluation system. These were: makes it possible for students to participate in curriculum planning, involves parent advisory groups in the development of the school budget, and allows for community participation in the selection of new staff members.

The low importance ratings of these competencies among urban and suburban groups are not, in every case, easily explained. The three competencies which received low ratings from both urban and suburban groups are competencies which, in the investigator's opinion

and experience, are not high in importance to any position or area group. At the elementary school level, for example, students are generally not considered competent to plan their own curriculum. The involvement of parent advisory groups in the development of the school budget is considered by many educators to be inappropriate; certificated staff are believed to possess the skills and knowledge necessary to plan the budget, while parent advisory groups are believed to be too unsophisticated in the ways and means of education to be able to offer appropriate advice. Allowing for community participation in the selection of new staff members is also considered to be inappropriate by many educators. The principal and the staff are the people who will work with the new staff member on a daily basis. As educators themselves, they believe they are in a better position to rationally select new staff members.

The reasons for the low ratings given to the other five competencies by urban groups are unclear. The competency "assists teachers in developing satisfactory student growth in basic skills" was perhaps rated low because teachers in urban schools already concentrate on teaching basic skills, and feel that they have no need to learn to do this better. The low rating on "allows for staff participation in the selection of new staff members" may be due to the fact that urban schools generally have many more staff members than suburban schools--aides, resource teachers, community liaisons, clerks, etc. Often there is a high turnover rate among these employees, and interview committees for new employees can take a great deal of time. It may well be that teachers trust the principal to interview new staff members and make an appropriate selection without their input.

Weighted Importance of the Competencies

The second step in the development of the evaluation systems was to establish a numerical value for the importance of each competency. To establish this numerical value, each competency was given a weighting of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5. Values of "1" were given to competencies with mean ratings by the area group of 3.00 to 3.36. Values of "2" were given to competencies with mean ratings of 3.37 to 3.77, and values of "3" were given to competencies with mean ratings of 3.78 to 4.18. Values of "4" were given to competencies with mean ratings of 4.19 to 4.59 and values of "5" were given to competencies with mean ratings of 4.60 to 5.00. The weighting factor was computed separately for urban and suburban groups.

The Evaluator

The next step in the development of the systems was to assign an evaluator or evaluators to each category of competency. Evaluators with mean ratings of 2.0 or more ("should be included") by the area group were assigned to each category of competency. For urban groups, principals and teachers were the evaluators for the first four categories of competencies, and superintendents and principals were the evaluators for the last four categories. For suburban groups, superintendents and principals were the evaluators for categories one, and five through eight, while principals were the evaluators for categories two, three, and four.

The Method of Evaluation

The final step in the development of the systems was to assign

a method or methods of evaluation to each category of competency. Evaluation methods with mean ratings of at least 2.0 or more ("acceptable method") were assigned to each category of competency. The system of evaluation for urban elementary school principals includes as methods of evaluation superintendent/teacher conference and superintendent/principal conference for the first four categories of competency, and superintendent/principal conference for the last four categories. The system of evaluation for suburban elementary school principals has one method of evaluation for all categories of competency--superintendent/principal conference.

The Systems

The following section contains the evaluation systems as developed using the procedures described above. Separate systems were developed for urban and suburban elementary school principals. Each system includes an instruction sheet, the competencies and their weighted values, the recommended evaluator, and the recommended method of evaluation.

A SYSTEM FOR THE EVALUATION OF

THE URBAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

THE EVALUATION OF THE
URBAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Instructions to the System User:

1. Rate the performance of the principal according to your perception of the degree of accomplishment in each of the competency areas in formulating your rating, consider concrete, observable behaviors of the principal. Degree of accomplishment should be rated as follows:

   0: Rate the principal "0" if he/she never performs this competency.

   1: Rate the principal "1" if he/she almost never performs this competency.

   2: Rate the principal "2" if he/she occasionally performs this competency.

   3: Rate the principal "3" if he/she frequently performs this competency.

   4. Rate the principal "4" if he/she almost always performs this competency.

   5. Rate the principal "5" if he/she always performs this competency.

2. Multiply the "degree of accomplishment" number by the weighted value of the competency.

3. Write the total score (degree of accomplishment x weighted value) on the line provided.

Instructions to the Evaluation Coordinator:

The principal's final score should be the mean of the total scores of those who rate his/her performance. If the recommended evaluators are "principal and teachers," randomly select a sample of teachers to complete the rating, in addition to the principal. If the recommended evaluators are "superintendent and principal," only the superintendent and the principal should complete the rating form, and the principal's total score is the mean of these two ratings. It is expected that during conferences between the superintendent and teachers and between the superintendent and the principal, all competencies will be discussed.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM COMPETENCIES

Recommended Evaluators: Principal, Teachers
Recommended Methods of Evaluation: Superintendent/Teacher Conference, Superintendent/Principal Conference

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
1. Creates a climate in which innovative ideas are encouraged.	____		4		____
2. Provides time for teachers from all grade levels to meet to articulate a coherent instructional program.	____		4		____
3. Ensures the development of an instructional program which meets the diverse needs of students.	____		4		____
4. Establishes procedures for the evaluation of the instructional program.	____		4		____
5. Collects and disseminates the results of evaluation procedures to the staff.	____		4		____
6. Provides for a balanced instructional program which includes the basic skill areas, music, art, science, social studies, and physical education.	____		3		____
7. Provides time for teachers at each grade level to meet to discuss common problems.	____		3		____

Instructional Program Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
8. Establishes procedures for modification of curriculum content and organization where needed.	____		3		____
9. Provides for a school curriculum which leads toward an understanding and appreciation of other cultures.	____		2		____
10. Provides for meeting the particular needs of limited and non-English speaking students.	____		2		____
11. Provides for the cooperative development (with students, teachers, and parents) of a school handbook containing information about the school.	____		2		____

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION COMPETENCIES

Recommended Evaluators: Principal, Teachers
Recommended Methods of Evaluation: Superintendent/Teacher Conference, Superintendent/Principal Conference

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
1. Provides for consistent follow-up services to teachers needing to improve their teaching performance.	____		5		____
2. Recommends teachers for retention, promotion, or dismissal.	____		5		____
3. Develops a uniform system of evaluation of teacher performance.	____		4		____
4. Assists teachers to improve their classroom atmosphere.	____		4		____
5. Maintains appropriate staff evaluation records.	____		4		____
6. Visits all classrooms to observe teaching behavior.	____		4		____
7. Provides feedback to teachers concerning their teaching performance.	____		4		____
8. Assists teachers to evaluate their instruction.	____		4		____

Instructional Supervision Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
9. Assists teachers to adjust their educational program to individual student needs, abilities, and learning styles.	____		4		____
10. Arranges for inservice programs based on the needs of the staff.	____		4		____
11. Assists teachers to establish meaningful goals and objectives for classroom learning.	____		4		____
12. Assists teachers to plan effectively for instruction.	____		4		____
13. Assists teachers in developing satisfactory student growth in basic skills.	____		4		____
14. Evaluates inservice programs.	____		3		____
15. Provides for variety in inservice activities including visitations, demonstrations, conferences, resource personnel, etc.	____		3		____
16. Guides individual teachers toward selective participation in inservice activities based on his/her evaluation of their inservice needs.	____		3		____

Instructional Supervision Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
17. Arranges for individual inservice based on teacher self-evaluation.	____		2		____
18. Trains other members of the staff to assume leadership roles in the inservice program.	____		2		____
19. Participates in school-wide inservice sessions as leader or audience.	____		2		____

STAFF COMPETENCIES

Recommended Evaluators: Principal, Teachers
Recommended Methods of Evaluation: Superintendent/Teacher Conference, Superintendent/Principal Conference

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
1. Is readily available for conferences with staff members.	____		5		____
2. Is aware of the provisions of staff contracts and does not violate them.	____		5		____
3. Interviews prospective staff members and makes recommendations for employment of personnel.	____		5		____
4. Assigns staff according to the skills, abilities, and preferences of staff members.	____		5		____
5. Encourages staff participation in the development of the instructional program.	____		5		____
6. Confers with staff concerning new and existing school problems.	____		5		____
7. Gives recognition to staff members for noteworthy accomplishments.	____		5		____
8. Makes staff members feel important and needed.	____		5		____

Staff Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
9. Defines specific role requirements for position vacancies when they occur.	____		4		____
10. Seeks and accepts staff criticism and advice on his/her performance as principal.	____		4		____
11. Uses staff ideas and opinions constructively in problem-solving.	____		4		____
12. Utilizes staff meetings as an opportunity to improve the instructional program.	____		4		____
13. Communicates to staff decisions and recommendations made at parent advisory committee meetings.	____		4		____
14. Follows up on staff recommendations, concerns, or complaints promptly.	____		4		____
15. Includes staff in designing methods for evaluating the curriculum.	____		4		____
16. Begins staff meetings on time and limits them to a reasonable length.	____		4		____
17. Publishes in memorandum form routine decisions or announcements.			4		____

Staff Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
18. Provides for continuous articulation among and between staff members involved in the instruction, testing, or counseling of students.	____		4		____
19. Provides for equitable distribution of non-teaching duties among staff members.	____		4		____
20. Establishes curriculum committees to plan for the use of instructional materials.	____		3		____
21. Clarifies the authority and responsibilities of each staff member.	____		3		____
22. Prepares and follows a relevant agenda for staff meetings.	____		3		____
23. Provides for the orientation of new staff members to the district, the school, the students, and the community.	____		2		____
24. Delegates tasks to staff members.	____		2		____

STUDENT COMPETENCIES

Recommended Evaluators: Principal, Teachers
Recommended Methods of Evaluation: Superintendent/Teacher Conference, Superintendent/Principal Conference

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
1. Takes effective action on discipline matters requiring his/her intervention.	____		5		____
2. Helps to establish standards for student conduct, in cooperation with teachers and parents.	____		5		____
3. Maintains student records in accordance with established Board of Education policy and state and federal laws.	____		4		____
4. Is available to students and willing to discuss their interests and concerns.	____		4		____
5. Provides the aid of professional specialists for students with special problems.	____		4		____
6. Provides for the periodic recognition of students who achieve excellence in the various areas of school life.	____		4		____
7. Provides for adequate and continuous supervision of student activities during ncon hours and recess periods.	____		4		____

Student Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
8. Provides for the safekeeping of the permanent records of students.	____		3		____
9. Ensures that student folders contain adequate and appropriate information.	____		3		____
10. Makes student records easily accessible to authorized personnel.	____		3		____
11. Generates solutions to individual student problems.	____		3		____
12. Makes it possible for each student to receive necessary guidance and counseling.	____		3		____
13. Seeks parental involvement in the solution of student problems.	____		3		____
14. Makes provision for a representative student council.	____		2		____
15. Employs a written policy concerning student promotion and retention.	____		2		____

FINANCIAL/PHYSICAL RESOURCES COMPETENCIES

Recommended Evaluators: Superintendent, Principal
Recommended Method of Evaluation: Superintendent/Principal Conference

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
1. Ensures that unsatisfactory, unsafe, or unsanitary conditions are corrected promptly.	____		5		____
2. Ensures that funds allocated to the school for categorical projects are spent according to the regulations of such projects.	____		5		____
3. Provides for the keeping of accurate records of all school monies received and spent.	____		4		____
4. Purchases services and materials in accordance with established budget procedures.	____		4		____
5. Formulates the school budget based on school priorities as determined by the staff and the parents.	____		4		____
6. Operates the school program within the allocated budget.	____		4		____
7. Interviews, assigns, and supervises custodial personnel to provide a physical environment that will enhance instruction.	____		3		____

Financial/Physical Resources Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
8. Provides a workable system for storage and accessibility of materials.	____		3		____
9. Ensures that school policies regarding use of equipment and materials and standards of cleanliness are followed.	____		3		____
10. Formulates the school budget based on school priorities as determined by the staff.	____		3		____
11. Maintains a bookkeeping and accounting system to meet district requirements.	____		3		____
12. Sees that buildings and grounds are checked periodically for safety.	____		3		____
13. Ensures that adequate space in which to work and relax is set aside for use by staff members.	____		3		____
14. Establishes procedures for replacement and repair of equipment.	____		3		____
15. Makes adequate provision for the use and care of special service areas, such as conference rooms, faculty room, storage areas, etc.	____		2		____

Financial/Physical Resources Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
16. Maintains an accurate inventory of supplies and equipment.	____		2		____
17. Gives consistent attention to improving interior and exterior school appearance.	____		2		____
18. Keeps abreast of new laws related to the area of school finance.	____		1		____
19. Makes periodic reports to the parents about school expenditures.	____		1		____

COMMUNITY COMPETENCIES

Recommended Evaluators: Principal, Superintendent
Recommended Method of Evaluation: Superintendent/Principal Conference

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
1. Ensures that parents are provided with regular, periodic reports concerning their children's progress.	____		5		____
2. Keeps the community informed concerning the school's activities, needs, and opportunities.	____		4		____
3. Replies to all inquiries from parents and others in the community promptly and courteously.	____		4		____
4. Encourages a broadly representative and active P.T.A., School Advisory Committee, School Site Council, and/or other school advisory group.	____		4		____
5. Arranges for parent advisory group meetings at a time convenient to parents.	____		4		____
6. Is readily available for conferences with parents.	____		4		____
7. Provides parent advisory group members with the training necessary to carry out their functions.	____		3		____
8. Arranges for parent advisory group meetings in a relaxed and comfortable environment.	____		3		____

Community Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
9. Involves representatives of the total school community in the formulation of school policies	____		3		____
10. Stays alert to the community and changing conditions that affect the school.	____		3		____
11. Assesses community expectations and satisfaction with the school program.	____		3		____
12. Surveys and analyzes resources of the community to determine their implications for enriching the educational program.	____		2		____
13. Assists teachers to utilize community resources in the school program.	____		2		____
14. Involves parent advisory groups in the development of school goals.	____		2		____
15. Provides for the recruitment and training of school volunteers.	____		2		____
16. Initiates, publicizes, and to the extent possible, adheres to an annual calendar of school activities.	____		2		____

Community Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
17. Organizes special events to stimulate interest in school activities.	____		1		____
18. Involves parent advisory groups in the development of methods, techniques, and the selection of materials designed to meet school objectives.	____		1		____
19. Encourages teachers to take an active part in parent-teacher organizations.	____		1		____

SCHOOL SYSTEM COMPETENCIES

Recommended Evaluators: Principal, Superintendent
Recommended Method of Evaluation: Superintendent/Principal Conference

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
1. Keeps staff informed of administrative and Board of Education policies.	____		5		____
2. Ensures that administrative and Board of Education policies are implemented consistently.	____		4		____
3. Keeps the district administration and the Board of Education informed of the school's activities.	____		4		____
4. Attends and contributes to district meetings where his/her attendance is expected.	____		4		____
5. Is aware of and ensures that legal mandates concerning categorical programs are followed in implementing such programs in the school.	____		4		____
6. Is aware of and interprets for the staff legal mandates concerning special education programs.	____		4		____
7. Is aware of and interprets for the staff legal mandates concerning bilingual education programs.	____		4		____
8. Utilizes district personnel and materials resources as appropriate in improving the school program.	____		4		____

School System Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
9. Relays concerns and recommendations of staff and parents to the central administration.	_____		4		_____
10. Maintains a supportive attitude toward administrative and Board of Education policies even when they may be contrary to his/her opinions.	_____		3		_____
11. Utilizes administrative and Board of Education recommendations in revising educational plans.	_____		3		_____
12. Submits required reports promptly and accurately.	_____		3		_____

PERSONAL/PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS COMPETENCIES

Recommended Evaluators: Superintendent, Principal
Recommended Method of Evaluation: Superintendent/Principal Conference

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
1. Demonstrates and encourages open, honest communication throughout the school.	____		5		____
2. Presents his/her ideas clearly, both orally and in writing.	____		4		____
3. Practices tactfulness as well as objectivity.	____		4		____
4. Is consistent in his/her behavior with students, staff, and parents.	____		4		____
5. Takes advantage of opportunities for his/her own professional growth.	____		3		____
6. Keeps informed about state and federal school laws, rules, and regulations, and their implications for school programs.	____		3		____
7. Is punctual in arriving at school, and at school and district meetings.	____		3		____
8. Reads current educational literature, disseminates pertinent information to staff, and utilizes such information in educational planning.	____		2		____

A SYSTEM FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE

SUBURBAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

THE EVALUATION OF THE
SUBURBAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Instructions to the System User:

1. Rate the performance of the principal according to your perception of the degree of accomplishment in each of the competency areas. In formulating your rating, consider concrete, observable behaviors of the principal. Degree of accomplishment should be rated as follows:

   0: Rate the principal "0" if he/she never performs this competency.

   1: Rate the principal "1" if he/she almost never performs this competency.

   2: Rate the principal "2" if he/she occasionally performs this competency.

   3: Rate the principal "3" if he/she frequently performs this competency.

   4: Rate the principal "4" if he/she almost always performs this competency.

   5: Rate the principal "5" if he/she always performs this competency.

2. Multiply the "degree of accomplishment" number by the weighted value of the competency.

3. Write the total score (degree of accomplishment x weighted value) on the line provided.

Instructions to the Evaluation Coordinator:

The principal's final score should be the mean of the total scores of those who rate his/her performance. If the recommended evaluators are superintendent and principal, the principal's total score is the mean of these two ratings. If the principal is the recommended evaluator, the score is his/her own ratings. It is expected that during conferences between the superintendent and the principal, all competencies will be discussed.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM COMPETENCIES

Recommended Evaluators: Superintendent, Principal
Recommended Method of Evaluation: Superintendent/Principal Conference

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
1. Provides time for teachers from all grade levels to meet to articulate a coherent instructional program throughout the school.	____		5		____
2. Creates a climate in which innovative ideas are encouraged.	____		4		____
3. Provides for a balanced instructional program which includes the basic skill areas, music, art, science, social studies, and physical education.	____		4		____
4. Establishes procedures for modification of curriculum content and organization where needed.	____		4		____
5. Ensures the development of an instructional program which meets the diverse needs of students.	____		4		____
6. Establishes procedures for the evaluation of the instructional program.	____		4		____

Instructional Program Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
7. Collects and disseminates the results of evaluation procedures to the staff.	____		4		____
8. Provides time for teachers at each grade level to meet to discuss common problems.	____		3		____
9. Provides for a school curriculum which leads toward an understanding and appreciation of other cultures.	____		3		____
10. Provides for meeting the particular needs of limited and non-English speaking students.	____		3		____
11. Provides for the cooperative development (with students, teachers, and parents) of a school handbook containing information about the school.	____		2		____

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION COMPETENCIES

Recommended Evaluators: Superintendent, Principal
Recommended Method of Evaluation: Superintendent/Principal Conference

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
1. Visits all classrooms to observe teaching behavior.	____		5		____
2. Provides feedback to teachers concerning their teaching performance.	____		5		____
3. Assists teachers to evaluate their instruction.	____		5		____
4. Assists teachers to adjust their educational program to individual student needs, abilities, and learning styles.	____		5		____
5. Develops a uniform system of evaluation of teacher performance.	____		4		____
6. Provides for consistent follow-up services to teachers needing to improve their teaching performance.	____		4		____
7. Maintains appropriate staff evaluation records.	____		4		____
8. Recommends teachers for retention, promotion, or dismissal.	____		4		____

Instructional Supervision Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
9. Arranges for inservice programs based on the needs of the staff.	____		4		____
10. Assists teachers to establish meaningful goals and objectives for classroom learning.	____		4		____
11. Assists teachers to plan effectively for instruction.	____		4		____
12. Assists teachers in developing satisfactory student growth in basic skills.	____		4		____
13. Provides for variety in inservice activities including visitations, demonstrations, conferences, resource personnel, etc.	____		4		____
14. Assists teacher to improve their classroom atmosphere.	____		4		
15. Arranges for individual inservice based on teacher self-evaluation.	____		3		____
16. Trains other members of the staff to assume leadership roles in the inservice program.	____		3		____

Instructional Supervision Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
17. Guides individual teachers toward selective participation in inservice activities based on his/her evaluation of their inservice needs.	____		3		____
18. Evaluates inservice programs.	____		3		____
19. Participates in school-wide inservice sessions as leader or audience.	____		3		____
20. Reviews written lesson plans.	____		3		____
21. Schedules classroom observational visits in advance with the teacher.	____		2		____
22. Maintains a professional library for teacher use.	____		1		____

STAFF COMPETENCIES

Recommended Evaluators: Superintendent, Principal
Recommended Method of Evaluation: Superintendent/Principal Conference

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
1. Follows up on staff recommendations, concerns, or complaints.	____		5		____
2. Begins staff meetings on time and limits them to a reasonable length.	____		5		____
3. Interviews prospective staff members and makes recommendations for employment of personnel.	____		5		____
4. Is readily available for conferences with staff members.	____		5		____
5. Encourages staff participation in the development of the instructional program.	____		5		____
6. Confers with staff concerning new and existing school problems.	____		5		____
7. Gives recognition to staff members for noteworthy accomplishments.	____		5		____
8. Makes staff members feel important and needed.	____		5		____

Staff Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
9. Provides for articulation among and between staff members involved in the instruction, testing, or counseling of students.	____		5		____
10. Assigns staff according to the skills, abilities, and preferences of staff members.	____		4		____
11. Uses staff ideas and opinions constructively in problem-solving.	____		4		____
12. Is aware of the provisions of staff contracts and does not violate them.	____		4		____
13. Publishes in memorandum form routine decisions or announcements.	____		4		____
14. Clarifies the authority and responsibilities of each staff member.	____		4		____
15. Communicates to staff decisions and recommendations made at parent advisory committee meetings.	____		4		____
16. Includes staff in designing methods for evaluating the curriculum.	____		4		____

Staff Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
17. Provides for equitable distribution of non-teaching duties among staff members.	____		4		____
18. Prepares and follows a relevant agenda for staff meetings.	____		4		____
19. Defines specific role requirements for position vacancies when they occur.	____		3		____
20. Seeks and accepts staff criticism and advice on his/her performance as principal.	____		3		____
21. Utilizes staff meetings as an opportunity to improve the instructional program.	____		3		____
22. Provides for the orientation of new staff members to the district, the school, the students, and the community.	____		3		____
23. Delegates tasks to staff members.	____		3		____
24. Establishes curriculum committees to plan for the use of instructional materials.	____		2		____

Staff Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
25. Allows for staff participation in the selection of new staff members.	____		1		____
26. Encourages staff participation in community affairs.	____		1		____

STUDENT COMPETENCIES

Recommended Evaluators: Superintendent, Principal
Recommended Method of Evaluation: Superintendent/Principal Conference

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
1. Takes effective action on discipline matters requiring his/her intervention.	____		5		____
2. Helps to establish standards for student conduct, in cooperation with teachers and parents.	____		5		____
3. Maintains student records in accordance with established Board of Education policy and state and federal laws.	____		5		____
4. Makes student records easily accessible to authorized personnel.	____		4		____
5. Is available to students and willing to discuss their interests and concerns.	____		4		____
6. Makes it possible for each student to receive necessary guidance and counseling.	____		4		____
7. Provides the aid of professional specialists for students with special problems.	____		4		____
8. Seeks parental involvement in the solution of student problems.	____		4		____

Student Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
9. Provides for the periodic recognition of students who achieve excellence in the various areas of school life.	____		4		____
10. Provides for adequate and continuous supervision of student activities during noon hours and recess periods.	____		4		____
11. Generates solutions to individual student problems.	____		3		____
12. Ensures that student folders contain adequate and appropriate information.	____		3		____
13. Makes provision for a representative student council.	____		2		____
14. Employs a written policy concerning student promotion and retention.	____		2		____
15. Provides for the safekeeping of the permanent records of students.	____		2		____

FINANCIAL/PHYSICAL RESOURCES COMPETENCIES

Recommended Evaluators: Superintendent, Principal
Recommended Method of Evaluation: Superintendent/Principal Conference

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
1. Sees that buildings and grounds are checked periodically for safety.	____		5		____
2. Ensures that unsatisfactory, unsafe, or unsanitary conditions are corrected promptly.	____		5		____
3. Provides for the keeping of accurate records of all school monies received and spent.	____		4		____
4. Purchases services and materials in accordance with established budget procedures.	____		4		____
5. Formulates the school budget based on school priorities as determined by the staff.	____		4		____
6. Maintains an accurate inventory of supplies and equipment.	____		4		____
7. Operates the school program within the allocated budget.	____		4		____
8. Ensures that funds allocated to the school for categorical projects are spent according to the regulations of such projects.	____		3		____

Financial/Physical Resources Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
9. Interviews, assigns, and supervises custodial personnel to provide a physical environment that will enhance instruction.	____		3		____
10. Provides a workable system for storage and accessibility of materials.	____		3		____
11. Ensures that school policies regarding use of equipment and materials and standards of cleanliness are followed.	____		3		____
12. Maintains a bookkeeping and accounting system to meet district requirements.	____		3		____
13. Makes adequate provision for the use and care of special service areas, such as conference rooms, faculty room, storage areas, etc.	____		3		____
14. Formulates the school budget based on school priorities as determined by the staff and the parents.	____		3		____
15. Ensures that adequate space in which to work and relax is set aside for use by staff members.	____		3		____
16. Establishes procedures for replacement and repair of equipment.	____		3		____

Financial/Physical Resources Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
17. Gives attention to improving interior and exterior school appearance.	____		2		____
18. Keeps abreast of new laws related to the area of school finance.	____		1		____
19. Makes periodic reports to the parents about school expenditures.	____		1		____

COMMUNITY COMPETENCIES

Recommended Evaluators: Superintendent/Principal
Recommended Method of Evaluation: Superintendent/Principal Conference

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
1. Is readily available for conferences with parents.	____		5		____
2. Keeps the community well-informed concerning the school's activities, needs, and opportunities.	____		4		____
3. Replies to all inquiries from parents and others in the community promptly and courteously.	____		4		____
4. Stays alert to the community and changing conditions that affect the school.	____		4		____
5. Ensures that parents are provided with regular, periodic reports concerning their children's progress.	____		4		____
6. Surveys and analyzes resources of the community to determine their implications for enriching the educational program.	____		3		____
7. Encourages a broadly representative and active P.T.A., School Advisory Committee, School Site Council, and/or other school advisory group.	____				____

Community Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
8. Provides parent advisory group members with the training necessary to carry out their functions.	____				____
9. Arranges for parent advisory group meetings in a relaxed and comfortable environment.	____				____
10. Arranges for parent advisory group meetings at a time convenient to parents.	____				____
11. Involves parent advisory groups in the development of school goals.	____				____
12. Assesses community expectations and satisfaction with the school program.	____				____
13. Organizes special events to stimulate interest in school activities.	____				____
14. Involves parent advisory groups in the development of methods, techniques, and the selection of materials designed to meet school objectives.	____				____
15. Initiates, publicizes, and to the extent possible adheres to an annual calendar of school activities.	____				____

Community Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
16. Assists teachers to utilize community resources in the school program.	____				____
17. Provides for the recruitment and training of school volunteers.	____				____
18. Encourages teachers to take an active part in parent-teacher organizations.	____				____
19. Involves representatives of the total school community in the formulation of school policies.	____				____

SCHOOL SYSTEM COMPETENCIES

Recommended Evaluators: Principal, Superintendent
Recommended Method of Evaluation: Superintendent/Principal Conference

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
1. Keeps staff informed of administrative and Board of Education policies.	____		5		____
2. Utilizes administrative and Board of Education recommendations in revising educational plans.	____		4		____
3. Submits required reports promptly and accurately.	____		4		____
4. Is aware of and interprets for the staff legal mandates concerning special education programs.	____		4		____
5. Ensures that administrative and Board of Education policies are implemented consistently.	____		4		____
6. Keeps the district administration and the Board of Education informed of the school's activities.	____		4		____
7. Attends and contributes to district meetings where his/her attendance is expected.	____		3		____
8. Relays concerns and recommendations of staff and parents to the central administration.	____		3		____

School System Competencies (continued)

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
9. Utilizes district personnel and materials resources as appropriate in improving the school program.	____		3		____
10. Is aware of and interprets for the staff legal mandates concerning bilingual education programs.	____		3		____
11. Maintains a supportive attitude toward administrative and Board of Education policies even when they may be contrary to his/her opinions.	____		2		____
12. Is aware of and ensures that legal mandates concerning categorical programs are followed in implementing such programs in the school.	____		1		____

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES

Recommended Evaluators: Superintendent/Principal
Recommended Method of Evaluation: Superintendent/Principal Conference

Competency	Degree of Accomplishment (0 - 5)	x	Weighted Value	=	Total Score
1. Demonstrates and encourages open, honest communication throughout the school.	____		5		____
2. Practices tactfulness as well as objectivity.	____		5		____
3. Is able to present his/her ideas clearly, both orally and in writing.	____		4		____
4. Is consistent in his/her behavior with students, staff, and parents.	____		4		____
5. Takes advantage of opportunities for his/her own professional growth.	____		3		____
6. Keeps informed about the state and federal school laws, rules, and regulations, and their implications for school programs.	____		3		____
7. Reads current educational literature, disseminates pertinent information to staff, and utilizes such information in educational planning.	____		3		____
8. Is punctual in arriving at school, and at school and district meetings.	____		2		____

Considerations in the Use of the Systems

In implementing this evaluation system in a school district, the following considerations should be kept in mind:

1. No evaluation system will be accepted by a group of administrators or teachers without provision for their own input. No decision to adopt the system should be made without providing all groups an opportunity to suggest changes, additions, and deletions. The system may be revised as appropriate to district needs.

2. The judgement of those involved in evaluation must be considered in light of factors which may interfere with objectivity. The skills, training, experience, background, ego-involvement, and unconscious bias of the evaluators may affect their judgment. In using the system, it must be emphasized that attention should be focused on the concrete and observable.

Recommendations for Further Study

Certain recommendations are appropriate as an extension of this study. These recommendations are as follows:

1. The system should be field tested in various urban and suburban elementary schools. Teams of evaluators should be involved in evaluating the same principal, and their results should be compared for reliability. The results of such field testing could be truly significant in the important task of developing more effective programs for the evaluation of school principals.

2. A second recommendation relates to the use of the evaluation findings. One important reason for evaluating the elementary school principal is to improve that individual's performance. Field testing of the system should include research into the effect of such evaluation on the elementary school principal's effectiveness.

3. A third recommendation is to undertake studies to investigate the underlying causes of effective and ineffective principal performance, and to develop a model for pre-service and in-service training.

4. The study did not clearly differentiate preferred evaluator or method of evaluation. A replication of the study should be done using a forced-choice method to more clearly define preferred evaluator and preferred method of evaluation.

The present study resulted in the development of a system for the evaluation of the elementary school principal. This is not the final and perfect answer to the problem of elementary school principal evaluation because many difficulties still hinder the development of the final and perfect system. There is the problem that the study of administration is not a single, unified field of inquiry. There is the problem that there is no clear, universally accepted image of the administrator. The very nature of the principal's position maximizes difficulties of evaluation. No category or competency system will completely describe the inclusive gestalt of the principal's role. All of these problems must be overcome before one can expect to

develop a completely satisfactory evaluation system for the elementary school principal.

It is hoped, however, that this study has made a contribution to the field. The system developed here provides an organized, objective process by which to evaluate the effectiveness of the elementary school principal, and it provides a rational basis for reconciling differing role expectations for the principalship. Use of the system by school districts will enable the principal to recognize his or her own specific strengths and weakness, will identify those principals whose performance is unacceptable, and will result in improved programs of preservice and inservice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Culbertson, Jack A., Curtis Henson, and Ruel Morrison, eds. Performance Objectives for School Principals. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1974.

Demeke, Howard J. Guidelines for Evaluation: The School Administrator. Phoenix: Arizona State University, 1976.

Elliott, David L., and Thomas J. Sergiovanni, Educational and Organizational Leadership in Elementary Schools. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Elsbree, Willard S., and Harold J. McNally. Elementary School Administration and Supervision. New York: American Book Company, 1951.

Faunce, Roland C. Secondary School Administration. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.

Flagle, Charles D., William H. Huggins, and Robert H. Roy. Operations Research in Systems Engineering. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1960.

Foskett, John M. The Normative World of the Elementary School Principal. Eugene: Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1967.

Garms, Walter I., James W. Guthrie, and Lawrence C. Pierce. School Finance. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.

Graff, Orin B., and Calvin M. Street. Improving Competence in Educational Administration. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956.

Graves, F. P. History of Education in Modern Times. New York: Macmillan Company, 1923.

Gross, Neal, and Robert E. Herriott. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

Harris, Ben M., and John D. King. Professional Supervisory Competencies. Austin: University of Texas, 1975.

Hemphill, John K., Daniel E. Griffiths, and Norman Frederiksen. Administrative Performance and Personality. New York: Teachers College, 1962.

Hughes, Larry W., and Gerald C. Ubben. The Elementary School Principal's Handbook. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.

Hummel, Raymond C., and John M. Nagle. Urban Education in America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Jarvis, Oscar T., ed. Elementary School Administration. Dubuque: William C. Brown Company, 1969.

_____, and Hasken R. Pounds. Organizing, Supervising, and Administering the Elementary School. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Kimbrough, Ralph B., and Michael Y. Nunnery. Educational Administration. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1976.

Lewis, James. School Management by Objectives. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Company, 1974.

Lipham, James M., and James A. Hoeh. The Principalship: Foundations and Functions. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

McMurray, Frank M. Elementary School Standards. New York: World Book Company, 1914.

Metcalf, Henry C., and L. Urwick, eds. Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett. New York: Harper, 1940.

Perry, Charles R., and Wesley A. Wildman. The Impact of Negotiations in Public Education: The Evidence from the Schools. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970.

Peterson, LeRoy J., Richard A. Rossmiller, and Marlin M. Volz. The Law and Public School Operation. New York: Harper and Row, 1978.

Pierce, Paul Revere. The Origin and Development of the Public School Principalship. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935.

Popham, W. James. Educational Evaluation. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

Reller, Theodore L. Educational Administration in Metropolitan Areas. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1974.

Rossmiller, Richard A., James A. Hale, and Lloyd E. Frohreich. Fiscal Capacity and Educational Finance. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970.

Saxe, Richard W., ed. Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1968.

Sirjamaki, John. The Sociology of Cities. New York: Random House, 1964.

Sizer, Theodore R. Urban Studies. New York: Free Press, 1971.

Snyder, Fred A., and R. Duane Peterson. Dynamics of Elementary School Administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970.

Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration. Better Teaching in School Administration. Nashville: Peabody College for Teachers, 1963.

Spindler, George D. Education and Culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Stoops, Emery, Max Rafferty, and Russell E. Johnson. Handbook of Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1975.

Sudman, Seymour. Applied Sampling. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: Free Press, 1964.

Periodicals

Boggs, J. "Board Regulations Concerning the Elementary School Principal," Elementary School Journal, XX (June, 1920), 731-42.

Brick, Michael, and Robert Sanchis. "Evaluating the Principal," Thrust for Educational Leadership, 2 (October, 1972), 32-34.

Courtis, S. A. "Possibilities and Potentialities in Measuring the Work of a Principal," American School Board Journal, LXXIV (December, 1926), 37-38.

Gray, William S. "The Work of Elementary School Principals," Elementary School Journal, IXX (September, 1918), 24-35.

"How School Systems Are Evaluating Their Principals," American School Board Journal, 163 (July, 1976), 24-25.

Keesler, Don C. "The Development of a Principal Self-Appraisal Program," American School Board Journal, 113 (September, 1946), 48-49.

Levenson, William B. "School Principals: On the Cross-Fire Line?" Clearing House, 45 (December, 1970), 216-18.

McAboy, Charles E. W. "Judging the Elementary School Principal," American School Board Journal, 96 (February, 1938), 26.

McClure, Worth. "The Functions of the Elementary School Principal," Elementary School Journal, XXI (March, 1921), 500-14.

McGregor, Douglas. "An Uneasy Look at Performance Appraisal," Harvard Business Review, 35 (May-June, 1957), 89-94.

Messner, Clarence J. "Appraising the Work of the Principal," National Elementary Principal, XV (June, 1936), 218-20.

Odiorne, George. "The Evaluation of School Principals," National Elementary Principal, LII (February, 1973), 36-38.

Poliakoff, Lorraine. "Recent Trends in the Evaluation of School Personnel," National Elementary Principal, LII (February, 1973), 39-40.

"A Procedure for the Rating of Principals," Elementary School Journal, XXIV (June, 1934), 732-34.

Randles, R. E. "The Principal and Negotiated Contracts," National Elementary Principal, 55 (November/December, 1975), 57-58.

Reavis, W. C. "The Duties of the Supervising Principal," Elementary School Journal, XIX (December, 1918), 279-84.

Rosenburg, Max. "How to Evaluate Your Principals Without Scaring or Turning Them Off," American School Board Journal, 60 (June, 1973), 35-36.

Sanacore, Joseph. "How Teachers Can Evaluate Their Principal," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 60 (October, 1976), 98-101.

Savage, William W. "Teachers and Parents Describe the Effective Principal's Behavior," Administrator's Notebook, IV (September, 1955), 1-4.

Spencer, Roger A. "The Work of the School Principal in Supervision," Elementary School Journal, XX (November, 1919), 176-87.

Stone, Ronald F. "The Principal as Chief Negotiator: Some Concerns for Teacher Supervision," Educational Leadership, 35 (April, 1978), 577-79.

Stout, Irving W., and Grace Langdon. "What Parents Want to Know About Their Schools," Nation's Schools, 60 (August, 1971), 45-48.

Strickler, Robert W. "The Evaluation of the Public School Principal," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 41 (February, 1957), 55-58.

Tiegs, E. W. "The Rating of Principals," American School Board Journal, LXXII (March, 1926), 43-45.

Towner, Earl M. "The Formal Rating of Elementary School Principals," Elementary School Journal, XXXV (June, 1935), 735-46.

Weber, S. E. "Rating Teachers and Principals to Improve Their Service," American School Board Journal, 80 (April, 1930), 47-49.

Other Sources

Administrator and Supervisor Evaluation. Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1977.

Administrator Management by Objectives. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 097 773, Feburary, 1974.

Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools of Chicago, 1926.

Barraclough, Terry. Administrator Evaluation. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 074 588, April, 1973.

California Public Schools Directory. Sacramento: Government Printing Office, 1979.

California Statistical Abstract. Sacramento: Documents Section, State of California, 1979.

Campbell, Roald F. The Evaluation of Administrative Performance. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 050 452, July, 1974.

Christiansen, Winfield Scott. "The Influence of the Behavior of the Elementary School Principal on the School He (sic) Administers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1962.

Coats, William D. Accountability in Education--The Kalamazoo Plan. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 106 946, February, 1975.

_____. How to Evaluate Your Administrative Staff, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 093 043, April, 1974.

DeVaughn, J. Everette. A Manual for Developing Reasonable, Objective, Non-discriminatory Standards for Evaluating Administrative Performance. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 060 500, June, 1975.

_____. Policies, Procedures, and Instruments in the Evaluation of Teacher and Administrator Performance. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 061 607, March, 1975.

Ellett, Chad D. Results Oriented Management in Education. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 131 591, December, 1976.

_____. Understanding and Using the Georgia Principal Assessment System. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 149 153, February, 1978.

Evaluating Administrative and Supervisory Performance. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 058 155, November, 1971.

Evaluation of Administrators: Guidelines and Procedures, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 105 580, January, 1971.

Evans, Michael C., Ben M. Harris, and Richard L. Palmer. A Diagnostic Assessment System for Professional Supervisory Competencies. Austin: University of Texas, 1975.

Falzetta, John N. "Role Expectations Held for the Elementary School Principal by Teachers, Principals, and Superintendents." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1967.

Frazier, Calvin M. "Role Expectations of the Elementary School Principal as Perceived by Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1964.

Giulieri, Elmo R. "The Role of the Elementary School Principal as Perceived by P.T.A. Executive Board Members and Principals." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1953.

Goldhammer, Keith. The School Principal. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 145 540, October, 1977.

Howland, George. Thirty-fourth Annual School Report. City of Chicago, 1934.

Increasing the Effectivenss of Educational Management. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 032 635, February, 1968.

Kerm, William E. How to Evaluate Administrative Staff, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 105 649, April, 1975.

Losak, John. "The Myth of Rational Evaluation." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, April, 1975.

Mangers, Dennis. The School Principal: Recommendations for Effective Leadership. Sacramento, California: Assembly Education Committee Task Force for Improvement of Preservice and Inservice Training for Public School Administrators, 1978.

National Education Association. Fourth Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1925.

National Education Association. Fifth Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1926.

National Education Association. Ninth Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1930.

National Education Association. Tenth Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1931.

National Education Association. The Elementary School Principal--A Research Study. Thirty-seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1958.

National Education Association. The Elementary School Principal in 1968. Forty-seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1968.

National Education Association. The Elementary School Principalship--Today and Tomorrow. Twenty-seventh Yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1948.

Natriello, Gary, et. al. A Summary of the Recent Literature on the Evaluation of Principals, Teachers, and Superintendents. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 141 407, February, 1974.

Nyquard, Debra D. Evaluating Administrative Performance. Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service, 1974.

Owens, Truman. "A Study of the Role of Elementary Principal as Perceived by Parents." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1963.

Phillips, John. "Principal Evaluation in Oakland." (Mimeographed.)

Pol, Gaston, Evaluation of Principals: A Competency-Based Methodology. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 127 668, July, 1976.

Redfern, George B. "Appraising Managerial Performance for Salary Purposes." Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February, 1974.

Rosenberg, Max. "The Evaluation of a School Principal." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1965.

Saif, Phillip S. A Handbook for the Evaluation of Classroom Teachers and School Principals. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 133 371, September, 1976.

School Effectiveness Study. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1977.

Seal, Edgar Z. Developing, Implementing, and Evaluation of a Model Program for Evaluation of School Principals. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 156 679, March, 1977.

Stemnock, Suzanne K. Evaluating Administrative Performance. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 032 635, February, 1968.

Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1875.

Twenty-fourth Annual Report of the Common Schools of Cincinnati, 1853.

Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1870.

Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1867.

Wills, Lewis A. Evaluation of Administrators: Issues and Priorities. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 125 083, June, 1976.

APPENDIX A

EVALUATION OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Your present position:

_____Teacher

_____Principal

_____Superintendent (or designee)

There are three sections to be completed in this survey. In the first section, "Relative Importance of Principal Competencies," please circle the number which best reflects your opinion regarding the importance of each competency.

In the second section, "Evaluator," please rate (from 1 to 3) the person(s) who, in your opinion, should be responsible for the evaluation of the competency. A rating of "3" would indicate primary responsibility for evaluation; "2" would indicate that the category of persons should be included in the evaluation; "1" would indicate that the category of persons should have no responsibility in evaluation.

In the third section, "Method of Evaluation," please rate the method(s), which, in your opinion, is/are the best one(s) to evaluate successful accomplishment of each competency. A rating of "3" would indicate the best method(s) of evaluation; "2" would indicate acceptable method(s) of evaluation; "1" would indicate a poor method of evaluation.

Please note that the word "Superintendent" as used in this study refers to the Central Office administrator who is responsible for the evaluation of the district's elementary school principals.

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR			METHOD OF EVALUATION				
							3=prim. resp. 2=included 1=no. resp.			3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method				
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
1. Create a climate in which innovative ideas are encouraged?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Provide for a balanced instructional program which includes the basic skill areas, music, art, science, social studies, and physical education?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Provide time for teachers at each grade level to meet to discuss common problems?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION How important is it that the principal:														
1. Develop a uniform system of evaluation of teacher performance?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Schedule classroom observational visits in advance with the teacher?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Provide for consistent follow-up services to teachers needing to improve their teaching performance?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Assist teachers to improve their classroom atmosphere?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
5. Maintain appropriate staff evaluation records?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
6. Arrange for individual inservice based on teacher self-evaluation?	0	1	2	3	4	5								

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR 3=prim. resp. 2=included 1=no. resp.			METHOD OF EVALUATION 3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method				
THE PRINCIPAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
7. Train other members of the staff to assume leadership roles in the inservice program?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
8. Recommend teachers for retention, promotion, or dismissal?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE STAFF How important is it that the principal:														
1. Define specific role requirements for position vacancies when they occur?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Assign staff according to the skills, abilities, and preferences of staff members?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Seek and accept staff criticism and advice on his/her performance as principal?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Establish curriculum committees to plan for the use of instructional materials?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
5. Use staff ideas and opinions constructively in problem-solving?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
6. Utilize staff meetings as an opportunity to improve the instructional program?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
7. Be aware of the provisions of staff contracts and not violate them?	0	1	2	3	4	5								

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR (3=prim. resp. 2=included 1=no. resp.)			METHOD OF EVALUATION (3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method)				
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE STAFF How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
8. Clarify the authority and responsibilities of each staff member?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
9. Communicate to staff decisions and recommendations made at parent advisory committee meetings?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE STUDENTS How important is it that the principal:														
1. Maintain student records in accordance with established Board of Education policy and state and federal laws?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Make student records easily accessible to authorized personnel?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Be generally available to students and willing to discuss their interests and concerns?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Generate solutions to individual student problems?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
5. Make provision for a representative student council?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
6. Employ a written policy concerning student promotion and retention?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL AND FINANCIAL/PHYSICAL RESOURCES How important is it that the principal:														
1. Provide for the keeping of accurate records of all school monies received and spent?	0	1	2	3	4	5								

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR			METHOD OF EVALUATION				
							3=prim. resp. 2=included 1=no. resp.			3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method				
THE PRINCIPAL AND FINANCIAL/PHYSICAL RESOURCES How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
2. Purchase services and materials in accordance with established budget procedures?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Ensure that funds allocated to the school for categorical projects are spent according to the regulations of such projects?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Interview, assign, and supervise custodial personnel to provide a physical environment that will enhance instruction?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
5. Ensure that unsatisfactory, unsafe, or unsanitary conditions are corrected promptly?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
6. Provide a workable system for storage and accessibility of materials?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
7. Ensure that school policies regarding use of equipment and materials and standards of cleanliness are followed?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE COMMUNITY How important is it that the principal:														
1. Keep the community well-informed concerning the school's activities, needs, and opportunities?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Reply to all inquiries from parents and others in the community promptly and courteously?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Survey and analyze resources of the community to determine their implications for enriching the educational program?	0	1	2	3	4	5								

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR (3=prim. resp. 2=included 1=no. resp.)			METHOD OF EVALUATION (3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method)				
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE COMMUNITY How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
4. Encourage a broadly representative and active P.T.A., School Advisory Committee, School Site Council, and/or other school advisory group?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
5. Provide parent advisory group members with the training necessary to carry out their functions?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
6. Arrange for parent advisory group meetings in a relaxed and comfortable environment?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
7. Arrange for parent advisory group meetings at a time convenient to parents?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE SCHOOL SYSTEM How important is it that the principal:														
1. Keep staff informed of administrative and Board of Education policies?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Utilize administrative and Board of Education recommendations in revising educational plans?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Submit required reports promptly and accurately?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Be aware of and interpret for the staff legal mandates concerning special education programs?	0	1	2	3	4	5								

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR (3=prim. resp. 2=included 1=no. resp.)			METHOD OF EVALUATION (3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method)				
THE PRINCIPAL'S PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
1. Consistently take advantage of opportunities for his/her own professional growth?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Keep informed about state and federal school laws, rules, and regulations, and their implications for school programs?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Be consistent in his/her behavior with students, staff, and parents?	0	1	2	3	4	5								

Thank you for completing this survey. Please check here if you would like a copy of the system for principal evaluation developed from the results of this study. ◯

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Your present position:

_____Teacher

_____Principal

_____Superintendent (or designee)

There are three sections to be completed in this survey. In the first section, "Relative Importance of Principal Competencies," please circle the number which reflects your opinion regarding the importance of each competency.

In the second section, "Evaluator," please rate (from 1 to 3) the person(s) who, in your opinion, should be responsible for the evaluation of the competency. A rating of "3" would indicate primary responsibility for evaluation; "2" would indicate that the category of persons should be included in the evaluation; "1" would indicate that the category of persons should have no responsibility in evaluation.

In the third section, "Method of Evaluation," please rate the method(s), which, in your opinion, is/are the best one(s) to evaluate successful accomplishment of each competency. A rating of "3" would indicate the best method(s) of evaluation; "2" would indicate acceptable method(s) of evaluation; "1" would indicate a poor method of evaluation.

Please note that the word "Superintendent" as used in this study refers to the Central Office administrator who is responsible for the evaluation of the district's elementary school principals.

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR (3=prim. resp. 2=included 1=no. resp.)			METHOD OF EVALUATION (3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method)				
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
1. Provide for a school curriculum which leads toward an understanding and appreciation of other cultures?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Provide for meeting the particular needs of limited and non-English speaking students?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Establish procedures for modification of curriculum content and organization where needed?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Provide time for teachers from all grade levels to meet to articulate a coherent instructional program throughout the school?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION How important is it that the principal:														
1. Regularly review written lesson plans?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Regularly visit all classrooms to observe teaching behavior?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Provide feedback to teachers concerning their teaching performance?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Assist teachers to evaluate their instruction?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
5. Assist teachers to adjust their educational program to individual student needs, abilities, and learning styles?	0	1	2	3	4	5								

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR (3=prim. resp. 2=included 1=no. resp.)			METHOD OF EVALUATION (3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method)				
THE PRINCIPAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
6. Arrange for inservice programs based on the needs of the staff?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
7. Guide individual teachers toward selective participation in inservice activities based on his/her evaluation of their inservice needs?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
8. Evaluate inservice programs?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE STAFF How important is it that the principal:														
1. Allow for staff participation in the selection of new staff members?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Provide for the orientation of new staff members to the district, the school, the students, and the community?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Promptly follow up on staff recommendations, concerns, or complaints?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Include staff in designing methods for evaluating the curriculum?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
5. Begin staff meetings on time and limit them to a reasonable length?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
6. Publish in memorandum form routine decisions or announcements?	0	1	2	3	4	5								

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR (3=prim. resp. 2=included 1=no. resp.)			METHOD OF EVALUATION (3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method)				
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE STAFF How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
7. Encourage staff participation in community affairs?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
8. Provide for equitable distribution of non-teaching duties among staff members?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
9. Delegate tasks to staff members?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE STUDENTS How important is it that the principal:														
1. Ensure that student folders contain adequate and appropriate information?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Help to establish standards for student conduct, in cooperation with teachers and parents?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Make it possible for each student to receive necessary guidance and counseling?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Seek parental involvement in the solution of student problems?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
5. Make it possible for students to participate in planning the curriculum?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL AND FINANCIAL/PHYSICAL RESOURCES How important is it that the principal:														
1. Formulate the school budget based on school priorities as determined by the staff?	0	1	2	3	4	5								

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR 3=prim. resp. 2=included 1=no. resp.			METHOD OF EVALUATION 3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method				
THE PRINCIPAL AND FINANCIAL/PHYSICAL RESOURCES How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
2. Maintain a bookkeeping and accounting system to meet district requirements?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Keep abreast of new laws related to the area of school finance?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. See that buildings and grounds are checked periodically for safety?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
5. Make adequate provision for the use and care of special service areas, such as conference rooms, faculty room, storage areas, etc.?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
6. Maintain an accurate inventory of supplies and equipment?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE COMMUNITY How important is it that the principal:														
1. Involve representatives of the total school community in the formulation of school policies?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Stay alert to the community and changing conditions that affect the school?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Assist teachers to utilize community resources in the school program?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Involve parent advisory groups in the development of school goals?	0	1	2	3	4	5								

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR 3=prim. resp. 2=included 1=no. resp.			METHOD OF EVALUATION 3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method				
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE COMMUNITY How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
5. Involve parent advisory groups in the development of the school budget?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
6. Provide for the recruitment and training of school volunteers?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
7. Allow for community participation in the selection of new staff members?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE SCHOOL SYSTEM How important is it that the principal:														
1. Ensure that administrative and Board of Education policies are implemented consistently?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Keep the district administration and the Board of Education informed of the school's activities?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Attend and contribute to district meetings where his/her attendance is expected?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Be aware of and ensure that legal mandates concerning categorical programs are followed in implementing such programs in the school?	0	1	2	3	4	5								

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR 3=prim. resp. 2=included 1=no. resp.			METHOD OF EVALUATION 3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method				
THE PRINCIPAL'S PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
1. Read current educational literature, disseminate pertinent information to staff, and utilize such information in educational planning?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Be able to present his/her ideas clearly, both orally and in writing?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Practice tactfulness as well as objectivity?	0	1	2	3	4	5								

Thank you for completing this survey. Please check here if you would like a copy of the system for principal evaluation developed from the results of this study. ◯

APPENDIX C

Survey #3

EVALUATION OF THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Your present position:

_____Teacher

_____Principal

_____Superintendent (or designee)

There are three sections to be completed in this survey. In the first section, "Relative Importance of Principal Competencies," please circle the number which reflects your opinion regarding the importance of each competency.

In the second section, "Evaluator," please rate (from 1 to 3) the person(s) who, in your opinion, should be responsible for the evaluation of the competency. A rating of "3" would indicate primary responsibility for evaluation; "2" would indicate that the category of persons should be included in the evaluation; "1" would indicate that the category of persons should have no responsibility in evaluation.

In the third section, "Method of Evaluation," please rate the method(s), which, in your opinion, is/are the best one(s) to evaluate successful accomplishment of each competency. A rating of "3" would indicate the best method(s) of evaluation; "2" would indicate acceptable method(s) of evaluation; "1" would indicate a poor method of evaluation.

Please note that the word "Superintendent" as used in this study refers to the Central Office administrator who is responsible for the evaluation of the district's elementary school principals.

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR 3=prim. resp. 2=included 1=no. resp.			METHOD OF EVALUATION 3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method				
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
1. Ensure the development of an instructional program which meets the diverse needs of students?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Establish procedures for the evaluation of the instructional program?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Collect and disseminate the results of evaluation procedures to the staff?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Provide for the cooperative development (with students, teachers, and parents) of a school handbook containing information about the school?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION How important is it that the principal:														
1. Assist teachers to establish meaningful goals and objectives for classroom learning?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Assist teachers to plan effectively for instruction?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Assist teachers in developing satisfactory student growth in basic skills?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Provide for variety in inservice activities including visitations, demonstrations, conferences, resource personnel, etc.?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
5. Participate in school-wide inservice sessions as leader or audience?	0	1	2	3	4	5								

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR			METHOD OF EVALUATION				
							3=prim. resp. 2=included 1=no. resp.			3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method				
THE PRINCIPAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
6. Maintain a professional library for teacher use?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE STAFF How important is it that the principal:														
1. Interview prospective staff members and make recommendations for employment of personnel?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Be readily available for conferences with staff members?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Encourage staff participation in the development of the instructional program?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Confer with staff concerning new and existing school problems?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
5. Prepare and follow a relevant agenda for staff meetings?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
6. Give recognition to staff members for noteworthy accomplishments?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
7. Make staff members feel important and needed?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
8. Provide for continuous articulation among and between staff members involved in the instruction, testing, or counseling of students?	0	1	2	3	4	5								

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR			METHOD OF EVALUATION				
							3=prim. resp. 2=included 1=no. resp.			3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method				
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE STUDENTS How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
1. Provide for the safekeeping of the permanent records of students?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Take effective action on discipline matters requiring his/her intervention?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Provide the aid of professional specialists for students with special problems?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Provide for the periodic recognition of students who achieve excellence in the various areas of school life?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
5. Provide for adequate and continuous supervision of student activities during noon hours and recess periods?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL AND FINANCIAL/PHYSICAL RESOURCES How important is it that the principal:														
1. Formulate the school budget based on school priorities as determined by the staff and the parents?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Operate the school program within the allocated budget?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Make periodic reports to the parents about school expenditures?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Give consistent attention to improving interior and exterior school appearance?	0	1	2	3	4	5								

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR (3=prim. resp. 2=included 1=no. resp.)			METHOD OF EVALUATION (3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method)				
THE PRINCIPAL AND FINANCIAL/PHYSICAL RESOURCES How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
5. Ensure that adequate space in which to work and relax is set aside for use by staff members?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
6. Establish procedures for replacement and repair of equipment?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE COMMUNITY How important is it that the principal:														
1. Be readily available for conferences with parents?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Periodically assess community expectations and satisfaction with the school program?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Organize special events to stimulate interest in school activities?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Involve parent advisory groups in the development of methods, techniques, and the selection of materials designed to meet school objectives?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
5. Encourage teachers to take an active part in parent-teacher organizations?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
6. Ensure that parents are provided with regular, periodic reports concerning their children's progress?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
7. Initiate, publicize, and to the extent possible adhere to an annual calendar of school activities?	0	1	2	3	4	5								

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PRINCIPAL COMPETENCIES							EVALUATOR			METHOD OF EVALUATION				
							3=prim. resp 2=included 1=no. resp.			3=best method 2=acceptable 1=poor method				
THE PRINCIPAL AND THE SCHOOL SYSTEM How important is it that the principal:	Not Important					Extremely Important	Superintendent	Teachers	Principal	Super./Teachers Conference	Super./Principal Conference	Super. Observation of Prin.	Super. Observation of Records	
1. Maintain a supportive attitude toward administrative and Board of Education policies even when they may be contrary to his/her opinions?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Promptly relay concerns and recommendations of staff and parents to the central administration?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
3. Be aware of and interpret for the staff legal mandates concerning bilingual education programs?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
4. Utilize district personnel and materials resources as appropriate in improving the school program?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
THE PRINCIPAL'S PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS How important is it that the principal:														
1. Be punctual in arriving at school, and at school and district meetings?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
2. Demonstrate and encourage open, honest communication throughout the school?	0	1	2	3	4	5								
Thank you for completing this survey. Please check here if you would like a copy of the system for principal evaluation developed from the results of this study. ○														